

THE

# CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> LIV. JANUARY 1889.

## ART. I.—GORDON'S LETTERS.

1. *Letters of General Gordon to his Sister, M. A. Gordon.* (London, 1888.)
2. *Reflections in Palestine, 1883.* By CHARLES GEORGE GORDON. (London, 1884.)

THESE *Letters of General Gordon*, written to a sister through a series of years (from 1854 to 1884), unavoidably remind us of Keble's simile of the 'twin stars' in his poem for St. Andrew's Day, of which he gives as the heading, 'He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias, and he brought him to Jesus.' They 'certify a brother's love,' as Keble puts it of St. Andrew, and are everywhere *sui generis*. Religion is the main subject of them, and the guidance of one for whose welfare he affectionately cared is their chief motive. 'What you have undergone,' he says to her in a parenthesis at p. 98, 'with my pushing at you with questions on religious matters, you will never forget.'

Their value to us is very much increased by the fact that he could never have foreseen their publication. Miss Gordon generously presents them to those who have ears to hear, and who respectfully care to know something of the inner life of her noble brother, and she adds none of the artificial and questionable matter with which editors usually adorn such a subject. We are not supplied with explanations and apologies, but are permitted to see the portrait and to form our own judgment of it in its different stages, and to watch the touches with which, year by year, he endeavoured to perfect it. Its interest is the greater because, like a Scripture portrait, it is so human. One is allowed to see in these familiar letters his weakness as well as his strength, after a fashion from which uninspired biographers, as we well know, too usually shrink.

In spite of theological eccentricities, and some curious

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIV.

S

theories about pre-existence, universal salvation, passing at death from one body to another—some of which we assume that he abandoned or modified, as *e.g.* his views as to universal salvation, upon which he tells us at p. 318 he had 'become much more timid about speaking'—it is most interesting to trace in these letters the way by which his practical and eminently honest and reverent mind, entirely untrained in the Church's Creeds, and practically unknowing of her traditions, arrived at that knowledge and fear and love of God which are the root of all real wisdom and strength. Peculiar theories, mentioned occasionally in a correspondence which ranges through so many years (a correspondence which he never revised for publication) are no proof that he continued to maintain them in the form in which he occasionally stated them. About that each reader must form his own conclusion. His mind was always open to fresh impressions, and he gratefully owns to constantly receiving additional teaching and light. A sentence at p. 366 in one of his latest letters gives an insight into his growth in humility of assertion which must be noted. He writes, 'In all things we should be very humble, for we really know nothing of ourselves. I own that day by day I know less, and am glad to give up any ideas I have.'

As we assume that the wish of those who feel any interest in the subject is to understand General Gordon, we shall aim at bringing together, for their benefit, his scattered expressions upon some leading subjects, in a way that the general reader of a book which deals with a period of more than thirty years cannot do. It is necessary for the reviewer to efface himself largely, and to quote, as some may think, to excess, from letters which give a species of autobiography of this remarkable man. It is inevitable, if the subject is of the value which we feel it to be. For we shall not, it is to be feared, see such men again for many a day, though words can hardly express how much we need them to be always with us.

In no spirit of disrespect to the Church, which he never exhibits, but justly emboldened by the success which was granted to him in the study of Holy Scripture, he affirms that by such study his faith was formed. The command of our Lord which he quotes, 'Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me,' came to him with force, and he manfully obeyed it. He says at p. 192, 'I base my belief on the Scripture entirely,' and at pp. 232-235 he enters into details—

'God has in His infinite wisdom incarnated His voice in the Scriptures. . . . To the carnal man it is an ordinary book. To the

spir  
the  
again  
arm  
that  
He s  
look  
toric  
myst  
I hav  
than  
'

some  
The  
the m  
inter  
conta  
then  
to me  
now  
And  
tius—  
'

Stop  
is dire

'N  
There  
this w  
giving

At pr

'C  
(that  
cover.  
The s  
One is

In  
expre  
weapo  
made  
wilder  
The m  
writte  
knowl

It v  
Holy  
revelat  
unders



spiritual man it is alive and makes alive. . . . The Scriptures are the Word of God, the sword of the Spirit, the only offensive weapon against our enemies. All the other arms of the Christian are defensive armour, Ephes. vi. 12-18. . . . God has opened my eyes to the truth that it is by the Scriptures that He will speak to man, and *rarely* will He speak in any other way; I would almost say *never*. . . . I now look upon the Scriptures as alive—living oracles—and not as a historical, religious book, as I have hitherto done, even when feeling its mystical character. I cannot say how important this vista is to me. I have said that as long as the newspaper affords one more attraction than the Bible, something must be wrong. . . .

'The body says, "Before I give up my carnal desires, show me something better. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." The body must have some reason before it will prefer the Bible to the newspaper: it must be so opened or represented as to be more interesting (Prov. ii. 1-9). Now if the body could see that the Bible contains an answer to every question, that it foretells, advises, &c., then it would prefer it to the newspaper. God has been very merciful to me in the thoughts I have had here regarding the Scriptures, and now I see lakes and seas of knowledge before me.'

And at pp. 254, 255 he writes four months later from Mauritius—

'I have come to a conclusion; may God give me grace to keep it! *Stop all newspapers*. It is no use mincing the matter; as the disease is dire, so also must be the remedy.

'Newspapers feed a passion. I have for giving my opinion. Therefore, as we have no right to judge, and have nothing to do with this world (of which we are not), this feeding must be cut short. . . . The giving up the papers may cause the starvation of my passion for politics.'

At pp. 241, 243 he says—

'God has given me so much treasure in the Bible, that ambition (that son of Anak) is very weak and ill, and I hope he will not recover. . . . I am fagged with this warfare, and you must be so also. The sons of Anak are enormous; their walls reach up to heaven. One is but a grasshopper.'

In connexion with General Gordon's unusually strong expressions as to Holy Scripture being a sure and certain weapon, far too much neglected, we naturally recall the use made of it by our Blessed Lord during His temptation in the wilderness, to which, however, General Gordon does not refer. The reply to each successive assault of Satan was, 'It is written.' So, we fear, not many in this generation, for want of knowledge of the Scriptures, can reply to his assaults.

It was his constant endeavour to connect the various parts of Holy Scripture, to make of it one whole, as being a continuous revelation of God's will and purpose, not otherwise to be understood. At p. 314 he writes—

'In the Scripture one sees the most wonderful exactitude of God's rule, which extends over all creation and tends to elevate our idea of His wonderful wisdom. He does, or overrules, an event in B.C., and fits that very event into an action in A.D., which shows that He overrules every intervening thing. I am more and more convinced day by day that the framework of events is fixed and determined, but that our part in connexion with them is the gain or loss we sustain. I like this, for it equalizes *all* work, great or humble. "Rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice because *your names are written in heaven.*"'

With insight, most valuable in a day when accuracy is not too highly prized, he says at p. 345: 'Truly the simple truths of the Bible have been so covered up with men's words that one has to dig in the ruins to find them. I am sure that much obscurity arises from our not using Scriptural *words*. Words . . . not in the Scriptures cause no end of trouble.' He enlarges upon this idea in his last book (*Reflections in Palestine*), where he says: 'May not the reason that there are such differences of opinion on religion be, that commentaries and other writings of *man* are read and studied, instead of the Scriptures searched?' He sums up at p. 386 his sense of the value of Holy Scripture—

'I have had many enjoyable things after the world's estimation, but there is nothing in any way to be compared to the study of God's Word. How wonderfully it fits in with the various events of life! Examine all things through the microscope of His Scriptures, how He turns this and that event, &c. . . . Poor, poor indeed, were the religion of Christ if it did not contain more than is generally accepted. Where is its comfort, where its support?'

He naturally traces our want of interest in spiritual things to the shallowness of our understanding and knowledge in them. How negligent we are in regard of children, through not beginning sufficiently early and before other tastes for trashy childish literature are formed, and through too often giving them their first knowledge of Holy Scripture vulgarized, diluted, and adapted in weak and human language which is not Scripture at all, and so makes no demand upon them for reverence. He says at pp. 81, 82, 83, 84—

'Psalm 119 is full of sayings respecting the necessity of an enlightened understanding in order to keep the commandments of God and to purify the heart. Christ says in Proverbs viii. 14, "*I am understanding.*"'

'To enable the affections to be purified, it is essentially necessary to understand the deep things of God. Affections will not leave a seen for an unseen thing unless a hope is given of attaining that

which is unseen. Christ Himself needed a hope to be set before Him ere He despised the shame of the Cross.

'The Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God. What is the moral of all this? Seek the opening of the understanding by the reading of the Scriptures, the softening of the conscience and the revival of the memory by prayer. This being done, the understanding, memory, and conscience work on the will, which coerces the affections, causes them to die, *i.e.* to care no more for the world, to rise and fix themselves on heavenly things.'

To know God in this way is one thing, merely to know about Him in the modern educational way is a far different thing. Doubtless we grow in grace through knowledge, but all depends upon the character of that knowledge. There is a qualifying remark of great value at p. 255 in regard of the benefit to be derived from the study of Holy Scripture. In his earnestness to drive home neglected truths he is generally moderate in the use of qualifications. They are so much laid hold of by weak persons with a view to explain away great truths, that they have often to be kept for a time in the background. 'We would like,' he says, 'to know Christ's life in our rooms *from the Bible*. God teaches it to us actually *by the trials of this life*.' And he had previously said at p. 128, 'I feel sure that no study without trial is of avail. Life must be lived to learn these truths. I believe if a man knows his Bible fairly, and then goes forth into the world, God will show him His works.'

The connexion he makes here between the *Word* and *works* of God is worth taking note of, as not being a chance and passing thought, but one which is needed to ensure that perfect knowledge and understanding of God which was General Gordon's great aim. The connexion occurs continually in Scripture and specially in the Psalms. 'The *Word* of the Lord is true, and all His *works* are faithful.' 'The *works* of His hands are verity and judgment; all His *commandments* are true.' 'The very heavens shall praise Thy wondrous *works*, and Thy *truth* in the congregation of the saints.' 'Not to forget the *works* of God, but to keep His *commandments*.' Of this knowledge of His *works* much is said in Scripture which does not seem to come within the modern Christian scheme. 'The *works* of the Lord are great; sought out of all them that have pleasure in them.' 'The merciful and gracious Lord hath so done His marvellous *works* that they ought to be had in remembrance.' 'Let your talking be of all His wondrous *works*.' The Psalms continually narrate and recapitulate His *works* in detail, His

works of creation and providence in the 104th Psalm, His judgments upon Egypt and the deliverance of His people, His care and chastisements of them in the wilderness, and their settlement in Canaan and so on, in subsequent Psalms. The daily providential arrangements for the individual Christian are His *works*, meant, as General Gordon's practical remark implies, to be studied, understood, and remembered gratefully by those who would arrive at a perfect understanding of God Himself. 'Thou Lord hast made me glad through Thy *works*, and I will rejoice in giving thanks for the *operations* of Thy hands.'

Men look upon God's works rather than into them, and without seeking the help with which divine works must always be examined if they are to be understood. The finite needs divine help in measuring the works of the infinite. We notice this remark at length because it is too valuable a qualification to be overlooked.

The ordinary critic, who is often a critic and nothing more, gifted with powers of destruction rather than of construction, with a keen eye to weaknesses, is likely to expect more frequent qualifications than he meets with, and to complain that General Gordon is often apt to see and state little more than one side of a subject. It may be so. We are dealing with private letters, it must be remembered, and not with essays. But the value there is in this sort of one-sidedness is much overlooked. It depends upon how it is used, and by whom. Many-sidedness has but little to show for itself in the way of result. It usually lands its professors, while trying to strike a balance, in a fog. In one of his letters from Rome, Mendelssohn defends such one-sidedness warmly.

'I may say to you confidentially,' he wrote, 'that I begin to feel the most decided hatred of all that is cosmopolitan. I dislike it just as I dislike many-sidedness. Anything that aspires to be distinguished, or beautiful, or really great, must be *one-sided*; but then this *one side* must be brought to a state of the most consummate perfection.'<sup>1</sup>

Must not onesidedness of statement often be the manner and tendency of a prophet? Is it not to our gain that it should be so? Would he be otherwise much understood or even listened to? Is there not a peculiar kind of message needed for reaching the deaf ears of each generation, and is it not best delivered by these so-called onesided men? To an easy-going, selfish, and luxurious generation, much devoted to pleasure (now called *recreation*)—a generation which, having no strong religious habits or practical faith in, or knowledge of God, is

<sup>1</sup> Mendelssohn's *Letters from Italy and Switzerland*, translated by Lady Wallace, 3rd edition, p. 158. London, 1864.

weakly turning religion into an amusement and excitement—a generation in which all classes are devoted to the reading of newspapers and exciting literature, and, to a larger extent than men care to realize, of a literature which is profane and licentious—to a generation which, for the first time in the history of our country, is able to read, from the highest rank in society to the lowest, and which reads everything but Holy Scripture—is this earnest Christian prophet sent, to tell us what all-engrossing, life-giving, and fascinating matter these Scriptures contain. Shall we make light of this message sent in God's mercy, not by an unknown, unacknowledged man like Jonah to Nineveh, but by a man to the nobility of whose character the world, and not merely our own country, testifies, and who has earned, as few public men have ever earned it, our love. Shall we criticize, dilute, and reject his message, and go on in our shallow and thoughtless way as before? Shall we not listen to his pleadings for such a study of Holy Scripture as was very much the practice in quieter days of our fathers, and refuse to welcome his reminder of its preciousness? That is the question, and a very weighty one it is. It may never be so put to us again that this Book, neglected so thoroughly in this reading generation, is the one Book which should attract and employ us. The Bishop of Ripon has lately said, in a lecture at Oxford, that 'an average Englishman's mental pabulum is the novel.' What the Englishman of the future, so fed and nourished, is likely to be fit for remains to be seen. We fear he will not be the type of Englishman which has made this country famous and respected.

We cannot doubt that it was for a public purpose that God led a man of such an active mind as General Gordon so much into solitude. He speaks during his sojourn in Mauritius of that place as Patmos. He writes at p. 86 to Miss Gordon: 'You must be more or less in the desert to use the scales of the Sanctuary, to see and weigh the true value of things and sayings.' By help of such solitude it was that he discovered what a depth there is in Holy Scripture, unfathomed and inexhaustible, and he proclaims his discovery in some such terms as did St. Andrew—'We have found the Messiah'—to an age which is content to look upon the surface of the Bible rather than into it—which being, in consequence, deficient in spiritual intelligence in the things of God, can only talk, even in its pulpits, a very human instead of a divine language, and performs its best works rather in the energy of the flesh than in the power of the Spirit. He speaks to an age which attaches no meaning to those weighty words of St. Paul to

Timothy : 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the *man of God* may be *perfect*.'

Some people may be disposed to regret that General Gordon did not bring to his study of Scripture a mind more stored with traditional Churchmanship. We doubt that view, though we can see what was lost by his not doing so. But considering the result of his labour, we accept thankfully his exceptional case, and can see that there was real gain as well as real loss to him and to us. God's special servants have, for some wise reason, often lacked the kind of preparation which men so much value. The *Reflections in Palestine*, published at his desire during the last year of his life, show, as is not to be expected in letters, at what eminently orthodox theological conclusions he arrived by means of an unusual process. With only such indirect help from Christian associations and surroundings as he had in common with men in general, he discovered by prayer and study the extraordinary spiritual depth and value of the Scriptures as a connected whole, to a degree which no Churchman can gainsay, though but a small number may ever accurately appreciate. Few men, very few, could have achieved General Gordon's remarkable success in such an undertaking by his method alone. We certainly do not recommend it for general imitation. But we believe that not otherwise than by his method could we have had such a forcible message as to Holy Scripture, nor so noble a theological summary as we have in his crowning pamphlet.

It is to be noted that his mind had not been at any time in early years a religious blank. But his religious training, for which he entertained no respect, had been sectarian and sensational. He apparently never possessed at any time of his life a friend who understood the position of the Church as an authority in doctrine and a divine guide and teacher. Of his early religious education he gives us some account in a letter from the Soudan in 1877 (p. 166) :—

'If I devote myself to this country as I intend to do (*Dieu dispose*), we shall never be able to discuss the old days again. They were most amusing to look back upon. You know in old times the "*wrestling*," as they called it, when they had what they were wrestling for all the time, prayer meetings every night ; what bondsmen we were ! What have you done with your religious library ? It must have cost a mint. Why, ten years ago it would have turned your hair grey to have thought of parting with it. What a terrible thing our education was ! how we suffered from it !'

And at pp. 178 and 197 he continues the subject :—



'The religion of these evangelicals gives no peace, and is a miserably poor comfort in trial.'

'What husks the evangelical religion is ! It is nothing more than the Law slightly veiled ; it is useless arguing with its followers !'

The workings of his mind in escaping by help of Holy Scripture on to firmer ground are well described by him. He was far, indeed, from being adverse to dogma, as one sees continually, and as is shown by a general expression at p. 98 : 'I like distinct colours, black and white ; I like decision.'

Good sense and thoroughness such as his might have been easily led to see that an independent work in regard of Holy Scripture like that which he undertook, must be very far from possible for ordinary people, and that, whatever might be his own success, the majority must ever say with the Ethiopian eunuch : 'How can I understand except some man should guide me ?' Would that good guides were more numerous, and that the Prayer Book was oftener suggested as the surest guide of all. His early training must be held accountable for many of his speculations and for some fanciful imperfections of creed which he expressed from time to time, but never on the subject of the Blessed Trinity.

He writes variously on the subject of baptism. He seems uncertain about its exact position to the very last. He says, and he seems to unsay upon this subject, even in his final pamphlet, *Reflections in Palestine*, in which he sums up so many things in entire agreement with the Church's creed. But, while evidently convinced of its supreme importance, he owns to wanting clear light about it, such light as the baptismal service and the Church catechism would have thrown upon it if he had referred to them, which he never seems to have done. He is troubled about belief in the candidate. He does not seem to have known that the Church demands repentance and *faith* in those who come to be baptized, and that she can do no more nor can anyone else. General Gordon's view of baptism conducted on the Church's terms seems to be entirely sound, but he insists on discussing a baptism in which her terms are wanting, which is surely a needless form of worry which might have been easily avoided. 'Baptism,' he says, 'raises man from the dead,' &c. And he adds soon afterwards, 'Baptism does not make a man a Christian. He who is not a Christian before, is not made a Christian by that rite.' His meaning appears to be, 'He who is not a *believer* before ;' but he keeps up the confusion, and never seems to have got rid of it. 'A believer is in baptism raised from the dead, has sin remitted, and does on his emerging from the water receive



the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in his body.' And then he defends infant baptism on account of the parents bringing the child in faith. This agrees of course with the Church Service and Catechism. But then he adds, 'He is not a Christian because he has been baptized.' 'If an unbaptized believer, shall not his non-baptism be counted baptism?' Such a postscript seems strangely out of place when such a transformation has just been stated by him as the result of baptism. And he repeats himself in this contradictory manner. 'Baptism,' he says, 'does not make a man a Christian any more than circumcision made a Jew.' 'Baptism is nothing, unbaptism is nothing, but faith which worketh by love.' And then we find expressions which the Church would endorse, such as 'Believers go into the font as sons of Adam and emerge as sons of God,' which agrees with the view of the Catechism and baptismal service that *repentance* and *faith* are required of persons to be baptized, or that, to use General Gordon's words, they should be 'believers.' The Prayer Book, of which he knew apparently far too little as a whole, would have vastly cleared his mind if those who should have done so had guided him to it. It is no wonder that he adds, 'There is much haziness as to the new birth, whether it is an entirely new formation, or whether it is the resurrection, or a resuscitation of an existing formation. It has troubled me for years to know what baptism meant.' He confuses baptism with the Apostolic laying on of hands and the gift of the Holy Spirit in confirmation. We have been obliged, in order to do justice to General Gordon, to consult his *Reflections in Palestine* rather than the *Letters to his Sister* for his views on baptism.

He was a communicant as often as possible from Easter Day 1854. He writes (p. 215), 'I cannot tell you how important I think it. The Communion is the peace offering. It ought to be taken very often.' And he adds at p. 218 of the *Letters*, 'I like Queen Elizabeth's lines on the sacrament:—

"Christ is the Word that spake it,  
He took the bread and brake it,  
And what that Word doth make it,  
I do receive and take it."

In his *Reflections in Palestine* he enters into the mystical import of the Eucharist very gravely and thoughtfully. On the subject of the two sacraments he is more explicit there than in the *Letters to Miss Gordon*.

These letters deal chiefly with his steady spiritual growth,

his constant increase in faith, humility, and self-mortification, his attainments in the knowledge of God, and his consequent new feelings towards Him. He says at p. 89 :—

‘It is difficult to talk on worldly subjects to people who do not trace *everything* to God. We glide into discussing the ways and means, and we ourselves forget how futile those ways and means are ; hence the necessity of being more alone. If we want martyrdom, state this doctrine and people will cease to regard us except as fanatics ; it is so very hurtful to our pride, to have Him intruded into our affairs.’

‘To be like Christ—what a deal it means, and how very feebly the mass of the world realizes it.’

And at p. 280 :—

‘God requires *everything* from us, and not till we give up every thought or wish for anything but Himself will He disclose Himself to us fully. Say we have one hundred things. If we give up ninety-nine and three-quarters to Him, yet we shall not realize more than a very small portion of His Presence. One might expect that by giving up so nearly all, one would be greatly blessed with His fulness ; but no, *everything* must be given up, and I believe it is that little quarter we retain which prevents us reaping our reward. If you look at it, you will see it is right, for the retention of the quarter means God and some creature comfort, *not God alone*. It is asking to serve God along with idols, even if it be only a *little one*. Any particle of self must be enmity to God, and unrest.’

‘I once thought it possible to bargain with Christ ; to say, I will give up half my desire of the world, and gain, in the gap, a corresponding measure of Christ. It was no good, I lost the half, but did not get the measure filled. Then I tried to give up a little more, but with the same result. Now, I think, God has shown me that it is not the least use trying these subtle bargains ; that the giving up little by little is more wearisome and trying than *one* surrender, and *that* I trust He will give me power to make.’

Seventeen years earlier he writes on the subject in a more qualifying manner. His later standard was a higher one, he was farther on the road towards the perfection at which he steadily aimed. How different from the view of the modern Christian is the next extract, written as far back as 1867. It has an exaggerated sound in days when ‘pious worldliness’ is the highest aim of most, when self-sacrifice is voted foolishness, when the prudence is praised which avoids anything involving worldly loss, when to mortify the flesh, with other such apostolic requirements, is counted as superstition. One has to suppose that the modern Christian must hold that because Christ suffered for us, and apostles, prophets, martyrs suffered, therefore we need not suffer. They lost this world for another ;

but we, in happier days, can possess both worlds! Such a change in the requirements of Christ's religion can scarcely be possible; and General Gordon's testimony, of which we quote a few out of many expressions, is the clearest that we can recall in our generation, that the demand upon Christians in the nineteenth century is, and must be, the same as in the first.

'We are placed upon earth,' he writes, 'in order to suffer like our Lord, not to enjoy life, except in doing His will. He will give us this frame of mind. It is not attained at once, but is a growth, the slower the more sure, and the sturdier. It is meant when our Lord says we must forsake *all* that we have in order to be His disciples; and it is only when we do so that we realize that we have given up nothing in comparison with what He has given us in certain possession' (p. 15).

And at p. 19: 'If we aspire to walk in the power of the new life we must cast away all hindrances. . . . Let us have the heavier apparent Cross (which is in reality the lightest one if we could see it) and the higher aspiration. . . . It is, as self is given up, so a man is holy.' And at p. 21: 'It is through crosses that we live: let us have few crosses and we shall starve and be cold; let us have plenty of crosses and we shall thrive. The secret of holiness and happiness is the indwelling of God.' Writing upon Easter Day, 1881, and speaking of the reunion of our Lord's soul and body, he adds (p. 219):—

'In our measure we have to bear the proportion of suffering which falls to us in virtue of our position as members of Christ's Body. The full suffering—the cup to the dregs—which He as our Head endured, must be allotted out to each member of His Body, according to the position of those members in relation to the Head.'

At p. 27: 'A suffering head implies suffering members.' And at p. 191: 'All cannot be bodily crucified; all must undergo a moral crucifixion, if they will taste of resurrection joys, in this earth.'

This question of suffering always interests him, and he regards it from many points. Writing from Jerusalem that he was giving himself with great patience to the study of the stars, he says (p. 315): 'Those worlds were made without the least effort, but our salvation took a weary life of hardship and very great suffering.' And he adds:—

'One thing I like to dwell on is the transcendent value of man. It would have cost no trouble for our Lord to have made another creation in our place. His taking our nature, He being God, shows that that nature was such as could hold Him and be a fit habitation

for His Godhead. Now, God could never take a wholly unlike or uncostly nature to be one with Him for ever.'

It is impossible, of course, to do justice by dislocated quotations to his directness and thoroughness. He repeats frequently practical remarks like the following at p. 227:—

'One may seek for holiness for itself; but that is not the proper motive, it must be sought for simply in Him. . . . To seek holiness, truth, purity, for themselves, may be from unworthy motives, and will not be allowed to, indeed cannot, succeed. . . . It evidently is the complete absorption of self in Christ, by which one feeling, one body, one soul, one essence, exist between us and Christ. . . . We become Levites; others may not reach this; they have their portion, even as the other tribes of Israel had portions, in the Holy Land. The Levites had no portion in the land; they had the Lord only; consequently, in having Him they had all things, far beyond what the other tribes had.'

And at p. 278:—

'I truly believe that there is no limit to the intimacy I may reach with Him, if I give up all resting on creatures; and I say it is, even humanly speaking, reasonable to seek this union. It is like this: I have a firm belief that I cannot possibly get any happiness apart from God, that I might as well seek for water from a stone as try to do so. I quite agree that *appearances* are against it, and that it does seem as though I could get happiness from other sources; but I have my past experience and God's word against such a delusion. I have come to the belief that it is only by such union that happiness can be attained. I like this thought, for it is clear and distinct. . . . As God is the source of all good and all happiness, *He is Himself* sufficient to satisfy all our longings, and to fill up the gap which the loss of the world leaves.'

He accepts in the spirit of a child, and literally, that which most of us think they may take figuratively; he favours no compromise, nor schemes of a partial service. In consequence, he continually reverts to his weariness in the effort to overcome, for it was no child's play.

'I do earnestly desire,' he writes at p. 202, 'a speedy death. I am weary of the continued conflict with my atrocious self. When He does smite, His arrows are almost too sharp for one to bear, I will not say *too* sharp, for He tempers His wind to the shorn lamb, but it is a wearisome life, and I am tired. Read the third chapter of Job; it expresses the bitterness of my heart at this moment; yet all this I have brought upon myself by the prayer, That I may know *myself*. What a fearful desire! That His will may be done. What a wish!'

To this depression there soon succeeded a brighter strain. He writes at p. 223:—

'I believe the pilgrimage to Mauritius will be blessed to me, for I was hanging about Jordan, *i.e.* wishing for death, and not caring to conquer the promised land, or to drive out the enemies. I scarcely cared whether they were there or not; I wanted the land without the conflict. . . . I reason this way; to attain the closest union with Christ is certainly to follow Him and forsake all position, rank, and honour of this world; all these things belong to Satan's kingdom and are drawbacks. Now I do not think a young Christian ought to enter upon this line, for he scarcely knows the cost; but I think when Christ gives a man, even to a very small degree, maturity in knowledge of Himself, then, after long and due consideration and prayer, this man may endeavour to cast off Satan's gifts. The query is and must be always, Could you find Christ sufficient if you did so? *I think so now*, but certainly could not have thought so a little time ago; there was the will, but the flesh was weak.'

In the simplest way he tells, at p. 199, of other causes of weariness:—

'I only wish you to know, *how worn I am through having to lean on God alone*. This seems odd, but it is so diametrically opposed to our flesh to do so, and it is very trying. . . . We may talk as we like, but our flesh needs *substance* and not *promises*, and I do not believe the flesh will ever agree to accept aught else, and, therefore, is doomed to anxiety and suffering. After my spirit I prefer the promise; after my flesh I prefer the 1,000 soldiers; not having them, my spirit lords it over the flesh and conquers, but the flesh suffers all the same. . . . When you are as dependent on God as I am, you will feel worn and tired of the servitude.

In connexion with such expressions of feeling we must notice those of a later date, which speak of contentment and satisfaction with trial and suffering. At p. 332 he writes:—

'What comforts me is the thought that we are being shaped here below into stones for the heavenly temple—that to be made like Him is the object of our earthly existence. He is the shaper and carpenter of the heavenly temple. *He must work us into shape*; our part is to be still in His hands; every vexation is a little chip; also we must not be in a hurry to go out of the quarry, for there is a certain place for each stone, and we must wait till the building is ready for that stone; it would put out the building if we were taken pell-mell. This also is a comfort in respect to ambition, for the things of this world are only important as tools to shape us into form.'

By those who feel that exceptional men are a difficulty, and that all men should be classified and ticketed, General Gordon has been described as a fatalist. But while he accepts the word in a certain sense, he safeguards it carefully. He says at p. 386:—

'It is a delightful thing to be a fatalist, not as that word is generally employed, but to accept that, *when things happen*, and not

*before*, God has for some wise reason so ordained them ; *all* things, not only the great things, but all the circumstances of life—that is what to me is meant by the words “Ye are dead.” We have nothing further to do when the scroll of events is unrolled than to accept them as being for the best ; but, *before it is unrolled* it is another matter, for you would not say, “I sat still and let things happen.” With this belief all I can say is, that amidst troubles and worries no one can have peace till he thus stays upon God—that gives a superhuman strength.’

His piety had nothing of the element of superstition in it. His trust in God never hindered him from the use of lawful and appointed means. A devout trust was united in him to a perfect contentedness to fail or be disappointed, and a conviction that all would turn out for the best if he had done his part. A friend is mentioned at p. 403 to whom, when finally leaving for Kartoum, General Gordon said on parting, ‘Everyone has to fail, or we should have too high a belief in our own powers. As yet I have been successful ; I have still to fail. I wish for humility, for God’s guidance, and for resignation to God’s will.’ His fatalism seems simply to have been of the healthy and manly sort, which is acknowledged by St. Paul—‘It is God that worketh in us, both to will and to do of His good pleasure.’

Some persons have thought him a species of idolater of Holy Scripture. Each of us has an idol, and most of us many idols, of a more or less fatal sort. In his strong devotion to these little known and considered Scriptures, he seems to us to lay himself open on one occasion only, in a remark at p. 233, to any charge of exaggeration in respect of them. There he says rather emphatically :—

‘My belief is, that whenever we are in doubt about anything, we should place the matter before God by prayer, then take the Bible, wherever we may be reading, and having our attention fixed on the subject of our prayer, seek to get the answer, and take it in just the same way as if we heard God’s voice.’

This remark, which is very unlike the usual tone of his mind, he seems to contradict in almost the next sentence of the same letter, as if he had been merely thinking aloud, and not committing himself to a conclusion. For he adds—

‘I have read the Scriptures and have got pearls from them, but as though from deduction or analogy, and not as directly from God, not as though He spoke or wrote to us.’

The sentences must be taken together, and we shall then have reason to doubt his placing any reliance on his suggestion

that Scripture may be treated and consulted, as he mentions, after the fashion of an oracle.

Of his clear, strong, practical belief in God's government and providence, men have heard much. He made no distinctions, but saw God's hand as clearly in the fall of a sparrow as in that of a dynasty. In a day like this, when with a greatly diminished faith from that of our fathers, men are forgetting God, when the customs with which more Christian ages naturally acknowledged God and Christ in daily life are being weakened or abandoned, when the bonds of marriage are treated as if they are divine bonds no longer, when Christian institutions and education are being generally secularized, and the democratic States throughout Europe are hastening to dissociate themselves from religion and the Church—we may well note the mind of this able man of affairs, who saw God as his superior, and the one only power to be seriously reckoned with in everything which he undertook. He writes at p. 96 :—

'Imagine the intricacy of the government of the world, the detail required for each person, each work, each rag of humanity, and judge of His wisdom who can never make the least mistake, and who is still and tranquil in the turmoil of it all. Exist in the world, do your part, but do not entangle yourself with it, so that when you leave it you will have no wrench ; that is true life. It is quite impossible anyone can be happy, or even tranquil, unless he accepts that God rules every little item of our daily life, permitting evil and turning it to our good.'

'He is the GOVERNOUR-GENERAL,' he writes at p. 168, 'and I am only His useless agent, by whom He deigns to work His will. I am only a straw, yet God gave the men in Darfour courage under me.'

'Belief,' he says at p. 107, 'makes man of no account at all ; unbelief engenders pride, for it gives him attributes of independence. *He* will do something *himself* ; *he* will give something to God ; God and *he* will work together ; *he* is necessary to God for this or that work. So speaks the flesh, which cannot know God.'

'A man' (p. 117) 'glories in some act he has performed. I say he has nothing to do with it ; that God used him, as we use any instrument ; that God could have worked with the smallest insect as well as with him, in spite of his pride and cleverness.'

How entirely such language is in harmony with our Lord's words to the Pharisees on his memorable entry in triumph into Jerusalem : 'I tell you that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out,' words which Keble enforces in his Palm Sunday poem, but of their meaning how few take note ! And at p. 247 :—



'The whole of religion consists in looking at God as the true Ruler, and above the agents He uses. No one can be at rest who regards the latter. We are as much worshippers of gold, silver, and "power" gods as the heathen. Though we do not acknowledge it, the flesh will always look to agents.'

At p. 112 :—

'The *sound* people!—what satisfaction does their religion give them? Their Father in heaven—what a distance they keep from Him! No nearness of acquaintance, if they disavow His working in *every* event of this life. God is not in all their thoughts.'

And at p. 92 :—

'I remember that God has at all times worked by weak and small means. All history shows this to be His mode, and so I believe, if He will, He may work by me. . . . Kings and Chronicles are full of the deliverances He wrought against all human calculations, when trusted in alone, and of the calamities that fell on those who mixed their trust in Him with a trust in other gods.'

At p. 150 he writes :—

'My opinion is that the Brussels Conference is doomed to fail. It is too mighty for God to use in His work. He never has done any of His great works by great men. . . . His honour is engaged to work with petty men and means.'

And at p. 160 :—

'God is a jealous God, and will not give His glory to another. He will certainly make men feel that He, and not their gods, is the Ruler. "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." All this points to the absolute rule God has over all events, good or evil. "Your own reason," "your judgment," are gods to us. Lean not on your own understanding, *i.e.* be a fool, in the world's language.'

It is the combination of wisdom and untiring energy with humility born of faith in General Gordon's character which so rivets our attention and respect. 'Strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life' meant everything to him. With singular earnestness he gave up all that was a hindrance when he knew it to be one.

'Scarcely a quiet day,' he says at p. 220, 'elapses without something being brought out which I had thought did not exist. I used to wander, as it were, through my heart, finding nice walks and splendid palaces in which I reposed. Then came the downfall of my Egyptian palace; it was mouldy, faded, and despicable; motives were discovered to be wholly earthly, and I turned from the ruins with disgust. Then I wandered into the last-visit-to-China palace, and it was splendid. However, only two or three days ago that appeared tattered and mildewed, so I have no pleasure in that ruin. Then

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIV.

T

came the smoking, which I enjoyed. To-day I have smitten that immense serpent. . . . I suppose this clearing out of oneself will go on, for as goodness is unfathomable so is evil. . . . Sometimes one was wont to think that really one was fairly free of the flesh, but alas! one seems scarcely to have begun. We have, as it were, been white-washing the exterior and leaving the drains alone. . . . All, all, all, or nothing, is what He will have. . . . The things of the exterior world have but very little to do with one when occupied with the drains of the heart. I like to tell you my experiences, humiliating as they are, for it is inevitable that you also have to go through them, now you have begun.'

The extracts we have made are insufficient to do justice to his real character, long and wearisome as we fear such extracts will appear to some persons. But people cannot realize, without such self-revelation, of what material, and by what painful and patient training a man who has stood out in his generation in such strong relief is formed. They suppose that some accident or happy magic shaped him, and that it cost no effort, no suffering. They need to be told that nobility of character so perfect is not a natural growth, and that it cannot be gained without effort, self-effacement, and self-mortification. Real goodness and greatness have ever come, as in this case, out of self-denial and suffering. In trials and troubles only can the highest lessons of Providence be learnt and the highest characters formed. When that view is in some measure understood we may hope for a more heartily uttered *Deo gratias* from General Gordon's countrymen. For certainly we in no way deserved him whose life and death, but little really understood, have hardly furnished more than a passing excitement.

The result of an entire confidence in God's fatherly care and government, of a sense that all things work together for good to those who love and fear Him, brought a solid peace and comfort, of which General Gordon often and gratefully writes. Of 'finding peace' we have heard overmuch from shallow religionists in these days as an expression of a feeling of excitable and transient security, often instantaneously acquired. Of such presumption there was nothing in him, as may be well believed. Peace came to him after much fighting, much suffering and patient waiting, of which these letters are a narrative. It was no cheaply-procured peace, and was, therefore, the more highly prized.

'I think,' he writes at p. 40, 'our life is summed up in patient waiting, and in being content with the evil of the day. Night soon comes, and with it comes rest.' 'Since I had the

pearl,' he writes at p. 130, "He careth for thee," I have had much comfort and peace.' And at p. 138 he says: 'It is no vain promise, Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed upon Thee.' At p. 350:—

'I have been much comforted for myself and you in the realization that in this life the position we occupy is as nothing; each is in his right place. St. Paul was not wanted for the time he was in prison at Caesarea. We may rest assured he was kept idle—no, not idle, but inactively employed—for some good purpose. . . . We all like activity and to be employed.'

An unaffected childlike depreciation of self is constantly met with in these letters in simple ways and words, which give the key to a heart over which he had long exercised that restraint and discipline which alone can preserve or restore the simplicity, humility, and modesty of childhood. How little parents remember its value in the training of children need not be said in a day when our Lord's answer to the question, 'Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' seems to be forgotten! To General Gordon the answer must have seemed decisive. 'Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.'

In one of his letters before leaving for his last work in the Soudan he writes, as if to sum up the whole matter: 'In all things we should be very humble, for we really know nothing of ourselves.' And again (p. 351), in connexion with the subject of charity and the avoidance of judging others, he says: 'Should God continue His mercy to me, as He gives it now, I shall be a bad companion, for I cannot without a *twinge* discuss anyone.' A man has attained an enviable height who can write calmly in this fashion after so many weary years of continuous effort.

He has some thoughtful words, at p. 52 and onwards, useful for a day like ours, in which philanthropy is very much divorced from theology, and the order of the Decalogue is generally reversed, our duty to our neighbour being much put by our preachers in advance of our duty to God, the only real motive for the inferior duty being withdrawn in this so-called *practical* preaching and work. He addresses the 'preachers,' and charges them with endeavouring to improve 'the flesh, which must die and be sown before it can be quickened,' with expecting a clean thing out of an unclean, instead of addressing themselves with spiritual light and force to the children of God, who lie misunderstood, uncared for, and largely unknown among us. We remember our Lord's charge to the twelve

when He sent them to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, 'Enquire who in it is worthy.' How many such jewels does our unspiritual philanthropy overlook and neglect among the crowded poor of our great towns?

'Explain,' he says, 'O preachers, how it is that we ask and do not get comfort. Is it not because ye speak to the flesh, which is at enmity to all that is spiritual, and must die? . . . You speak of Heaven, but belie your words by making your home here. Be as uncharitable as you like, but attend my church or chapel regularly. . . . Where would you find more hardness to a fallen one than you would in a congregation of worshippers of the Church of this day? Surely this hardness is of the devil. . . . Society (he says, p. 57) seeks to make the world a better home, and condemns those works which would incommode it; but society takes little heed of those works which do not materially interfere with its comfort and well-being. This is right so far as acts are concerned, but it should extend also to the sins of the heart. Society is the creature, and the creature knows only the flesh, which has to be restrained outwardly by the Law.'

And at pp. 66-7, speaking of the two kingdoms, of one of which Christ is King, and of the other the Devil, anti-Christ, he says:—

'The Kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom; that of the earth is an earthly or fleshly kingdom. The people of God are united by spiritual union to their King; the people of the earth are united by fleshly ties to their king. . . . The one people look to this world as their home; their efforts are to ameliorate it, and render it more of a resting-place—thence all temperance and similar societies. If all disease, pain, sorrow, and care were removed, they would desire no other home; and even though these are not removed, yet their desire is still for this world, in which all their joys and pleasures are found. The other people look on this world as a wilderness, in which they are sojourners and pilgrims. To them the removal of all pain, disease, sorrow, and care would still make it no home. They have no abiding city here, but are strangers. "They seek a country." To the one, death is the end of all their hopes; to the other, death is the gate of everlasting life.'

That the Church (or the preachers, as General Gordon puts it) is so vigorously taking up with the work of 'society,' so largely dealing with the surface of things, or, as he says, with the improvement of the flesh to the neglect of her real spiritual work, is sufficiently serious, and he dwells upon it for many pages. 'Flesh can believe only what it sees,' he says at p. 59; 'it is therefore condemned, it cannot enter the gates of heaven, though they are never shut; for there shall in no wise enter anything that defileth.' Of St. John Baptist he says at p. 70: 'John's idea was the reform of abuses; to him the

world was capable of amelioration.' But he points to a higher ministry, his own being only transitory.

'He testified that his ministry was only a precursor to one of a higher description, the cleansing effects of which would be as superior to his as fire is to water. . . . When John ceases his preaching (which the world will bear to a certain point, and with which Pharisees will also agree as far as discussing the question of the purifying of the flesh with him), then Jesus begins. He declares that the flesh cannot inherit, but must be buried in Jordan and raised again. . . . In the power of this resurrection life we, or rather *God in us*, can do all things.'

Certainly our modern efforts are increasingly on the side of ameliorating and transforming the world, rather than performing the spiritual work for which at Pentecost the Church of Christ was qualified and endowed.

He treats occasionally of missions to the heathen, and makes comparisons of those which he has had the opportunity of observing. He contrasts the Roman Catholic missions in China with other missions there, and expresses great admiration of the unworldliness and thoroughness of the former. He tells of their missionaries as having stripped themselves of everything, having taken leave of their friends as if they were going to execution, having gone out *never* to return; while other missionaries, weighted with wives and families and a variety of self-imposed anxieties, display the burdened spirit of Martha rather than that of Mary. And he refers at p. 177 to his passage to China with twenty young missionaries, of whom he says:—

'Was not their action more Christlike than those of our persuasion who go out to the ports with 300*l.* a year for a couple or for four years, and whose bread is sure, while these Roman Catholic students went and lived as they could among the native Chinese. Why does the Romish Church thrive with so many errors in it? It is because these godly men in her, who live Christ's life, bring a blessing on the whole community. For self-devotion, for self-denial, the Roman Catholic Church is in advance of our present-day Protestantism. Actions speak loudly, and are read of all; words are as the breath of man.'

He gives his views of the present state of the world and Church in no very bright colours. Of the degradations of modern trade in England he speaks with sorrow at p. 185. 'I feel sure it is nearly over with us.' 'It is money, money, money.' Of India he writes at p. 208:—

'India is the most wretched of countries. The way Europeans live there is absurd in its luxury; they seem utterly effeminate and not to have an idea beyond the rupee. . . . I declare I think we are not far

off losing it. I should say it is the worst school for young people. Everyone is always grumbling, which amuses me. The united salaries of four judges were 22,000*l.* a year. A. B. had been five years in India, and had received in that time 37,000*l.*! It cannot last.'

The general state of the Church he describes as unsatisfactory, and considers her condition to be that of the Church of Laodicea, on too good terms with herself, lukewarm, trusting in a false security, thinking herself rich while she is poor, and wanting in power; the religious divisions and the low spirits of believers generally he considers to be the consequence of keeping in the background the fact of the actual presence of the Holy Ghost in Christ's members. 'As the Great Guide is ignored,' he says, 'men seek guidance in their own inventions.' 'We are lukewarm; we do a great deal in His name, but not in His way, or according to His will.' 'All holiness,' he adds, 'is from the Holy Ghost, working in us in union with Christ. We are the branches, Christ is the root, the Holy Ghost is the sap.' And elsewhere he puts it: 'The grand distinctive mark of the Christian religion, which causes it to differ from any other religion, is the indwelling of God in man.'

He remarks of the clergy at p. 309:—

'It is here, I think, our clergy fail: there is too much secular-work, mothers' meetings, &c. &c., and not enough study. I think that the study of Holy Scripture, the avoidance of scandal or picking to pieces, the visiting of the sick, with earnest prayer, would tend towards the perfecting of a Christian; something is wanting if any one of these is neglected. . . . The more one dwells on eternal things, the smaller appears the behaviour of Smith or Jones, or the acts of Robinson.'

And again, pp. 325-6:—

'I believe the deadness in some of the clergy is owing, firstly, to not reading the Scriptures; secondly, to not meditating over them; thirdly, to not praying sufficiently; fourthly, to being taken up with religious secular work (Acts vi. 2-4). I wonder how it is that, when a subject of the greatest import is brought up, one sees so very little interest taken in it; and how willingly it is allowed to drop with a sort of "Oh yes; I know all about that." I believe the smallest word one speaks by the Spirit is all that is needed. If it does not work its way, the longest sermon will not do so. The fact is the Spirit gives life. . . . In reality, the flesh likes fuss and activity and to be of importance; it thinks it is doing a great deal when it is really only hindering; still this view may be distorted, and used as a temptation to do nothing. . . . Our Lord never seemed pressed, but was always calm and ready to state the greatest truths.'

The Church and the world are much confused nowadays in men's minds. There was a time when Christians aimed at *converting* a world which nowadays they seem to have decided on only *mending*. They would make a safe resting-place of that through which their Lord passed as a rejected pilgrim, while *still* rejection should be their lot, as our Lord foretold, if they are only worthy of it. And yet the Church's commission is a permanent one, and her gifts for executing it, though hidden, have not been withdrawn.

Many of the quotations which we have given will perhaps strike a cursory reader as commonplace. He may think he has heard them all before. Very likely he has, in a way; but how often has he heard them from a man who sincerely and thoughtfully believed in them, and who meant to reduce the commonplace to practice, or, still more, had already practised it before laying it upon others? In an affair of this sort the force of the words lies in the faith and manly sincerity of the speaker. The simplest words then become weighty and powerful and instructive, in spite of their lacking eloquence and so-called originality. True originality, as Ruskin defines it (*i.e.* 'not newness, but only genuineness'), General Gordon certainly possessed; 'the faculty of getting to the Spring of things, and working out from *that*; the coolness, and clearness, and deliciousness of the water fresh from the fountain head, opposed to the thick, hot, unrefreshing drainage from other men's meadows.'<sup>1</sup>

It is no new story of which these letters treat, and is not one which favours excitement. It is told to our great advantage by a man of faith, who narrates his own simple experience and efforts, his failures and successes, and illustrates his words by his life. Such are not the ordinary sermons of our day, but they are the sermons of which the Church greatly stands in need in these days of much pointless preaching, in which God seems to become less and less, and ourselves more and more, the subject-matter—days of much philanthropy and of much effort to suppress evil, but of small effort or even desire for the Presence of God, which alone can cast it out.

<sup>1</sup> Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, part iii. § 2, ch. iii. p. 157. 2nd edition, 1848.



## ART. II.—THE NAMES OF GOD.

*The Names of God in Holy Scripture : a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships.* By ANDREW JUKES. (London, 1888.)

THIS is not a finished book, neither does it go deep into the critical discussion of Old Testament questions ; nevertheless it is a beautiful and in many respects a valuable work. From a religious point of view there can only be one opinion as to its merits. It is in the highest degree invigorating, breathing, as it does, a spirit of deep piety and reverence. But its merits as an exegesis must by no means be overlooked. It is true it does not go into purely critical discussion, but it manifests a deep and wide acquaintance with the Scriptures. And this, if we mistake not, is of even greater value than the profoundest critical discussion. It has recently been pointed out that the real answer to some of the most vexed questions is to be found, not in distant excursions into comparative etymology and mythology, but in what many renowned critics so signally lack, an accurate and scientific knowledge of the contents of Scripture. The reader will find a good deal of this knowledge in this, as in all Mr. Jukes' works, combined with great clearness and power of exposition.

The subject is a study of the names of God—a branch of theology which has not commanded amongst ourselves the attention which its great importance merits. The author takes up in succession the Old Testament names, beginning with Elohim, and concludes with the perfect revelation, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost of the New Testament. His object is to present in a popular form, for the edification of the religious mind, the exact meaning and import of each name ; and this, not from an etymological or literary point of view, but from the presupposition that each of the names is the embodiment of a special revelation. The result on a general view is very striking. It tends to draw even closer the connexion, and to unveil the unity, of the two Testaments. It is found that many of the most precious and most cherished revelations of the New Testament were foreshadowed, and existed in embryo, embedded in these names of God. Altogether our idea of God is elevated, and our knowledge of the marvels and extent of His revelation of Himself is enhanced. And it is a peculiarity of the deeply religious mind of the author

that he has brought out from these names many aspects of God, not fanciful but based on real grounds, which are inexpressibly touching.

It may be asked : What ground is there for supposing that each of these names of God is the embodiment of a special revelation ? Would it not, it might be urged, be more natural to suppose that they are appellatives, arising, according to a natural process, out of the language and modes of thought of the Hebrew people, viewed as a branch of the Shemitic race ? This, of course, is the point of view from which the naturalistic critic would regard the matter ; and if there is any truth in it, it would certainly be fallacious to attribute to the names a special significance as revelations. Rather they must be viewed as the natural product of the Hebrew people building on foundations common to them with the other branches of their race. And in order to understand them properly we must trace them back etymologically, we must distinguish the elements contained in them, and trace the formative process through which they passed till they became fixed as names of God in the books of the Bible. The idea is very plausible, but it will not stand in the light of facts. For all these names of God are new names. They are not names which were in use previously to revelation ; neither are they names which were used by the Hebrews in common with other Shemitic peoples. Rather they originated within the sphere of revelation, and are never used outside that sphere. Moreover there is this peculiarity in regard to them, that they are all of a highly artificial character. They bear the impress of being words coined or constructed for a special purpose. This is undoubtedly the case in regard to Jehovah, but it is also true of Elohim and the others. If we weigh well these facts, we shall see great reason for excluding the idea of a natural development of the names. This at least is certain, that they had an abrupt or sudden origin ; and the only question is : How are we to represent the circumstances which occasioned their introduction ? Obviously it must have been from the sudden prevalence of new ideas and new impressions which could be represented or expressed in no other way. The question as between the naturalistic critic and the supernaturalist is thus narrowed down to the further question : Whence did these new ideas and impressions come ? Was it from below or from above ? Were they the natural product of the human spirit reaching forth to higher things, or were they the result of a higher light breaking in upon men ? The abruptness with which the names came in seems incompatible

with the former supposition ; but it is no use discussing *à priori* probabilities. We must look at the facts.

If we turn to the Bible itself, we are left in no doubt. The names were in every case either given by revelation, or were invented to express impressions communicated by revelation. And it is worth while to recall to memory the Bible idea of revelation, at least in its earliest form. The Bible teaches that God stooping down to His creature presents Himself face to face with man. He presents Himself not in His own essential being, for that is too high for man to behold, but under a lower form—a form, however, which is instinct with the power and presence of God. At first God revealed Himself under the form of a living being, the angel of the Lord ; and of him it is expressly said 'My Name,' that is My presence, is in him. Later, God revealed Himself from the cloud, and from between the cherubim in the sanctuary. It was from these various outward forms that the revealing Word issued, which spake to man, and unveiled, so to speak, the inner mind and heart of God. Revelation was thus something very definite ; it was something objective to, or outside of, the recipient ; it was something about which there could be no mistake, and of the reality of which not only the recipient, but anyone else, could satisfy himself. Hence it was accepted by the people as undoubted fact, and their whole national life and history grew out of it.

If we bear this in mind, we shall see how the Divine names originated, and how it is that they are the embodiment of a special revelation. Whenever in these revelations an aspect or attribute of the Divine being was unveiled, which it was of the utmost importance that man should remember and have ever before him, it was embodied in a name. And it was in this way and no other that the names of God originated. The whole process is seen exemplified in the revelation to Hagar in the wilderness. When Hagar had fled from her mistress, the angel of the Lord appeared to her in the wilderness, and spoke to her in words of comfort, of promise, and of hope. That which most deeply impressed itself upon Hagar's mind as the result of this revelation, was the all-seeing eye of God, which finds out and beholds those who seem most forsaken and desolate ; and hence she herself gave to God a new name, the name of the Seeing One, as expressive of this precious attribute. Or to take another example, where the appellatives or names do not arise out of, but are actually given by God Himself in revelation. This instance occurred at the first breach of the covenant, and the revelation was to Moses. It

is said: 'The Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth.'<sup>1</sup>

Thus the names of God are intimately associated with, and grow out of, the revelations which God has given of Himself. And we may here point out in passing the great weight of evidence on which the truth of these revelations rests. It is not, as many suppose, that they are accredited to us only on the authority of old tradition. On the contrary they form the pith and marrow, the whole backbone, so to speak, of Israel. It is out of them that the laws, the institutions, and even the history of the people grow. If we remove them, we remove the light which can alone explain the ideas, the customs, the history of Israel. The whole life of Israel apart from them is unintelligible; and hence they rest not only on direct evidence, but indirectly on facts of history which none can question—facts which could not have existed but for the revelations.

It is not, however, our present business to argue for the truth of revelation; and there is only one further remark we have to make regarding it. It is, that, whatever view we may take of the reality of these revelations, the knowledge of God which we get by them can never be brought into competition with that knowledge of God which we get by our natural faculties. The relation which subsists between the two kinds of knowledge is not, as many suppose, that revelation gives perfectly that knowledge of God which our natural faculties give more or less imperfectly. On the contrary, the two kinds of knowledge belong to totally different spheres. And as this is a point which is not only important in itself, but also has a bearing on the interpretation of the names of God, we desire to say a few words regarding it.

The Bible is very far from depreciating our natural knowledge of God. On the contrary, it magnifies it and makes constant appeals to it. The fundamental view which the Bible takes of nature is that it is a manifestation of the glory of God; and it recognizes the fact that man from the contemplation of the works of nature can rise to the knowledge of God, its Author. The reader will recall numerous passages in which nature is appealed to as manifesting God. It is said, 'He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? or He that made the eye, shall He not see?' And again, 'The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His

<sup>1</sup> Exodus xxxiv. 5, 6.

handiwork.' St. Paul, in fact, was speaking quite in the spirit of the elder covenant when he said, 'The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.' Indeed, our natural knowledge of God, so far from being depreciated, is presupposed throughout the Bible as the basis on which the knowledge by revelation is erected. But what is the real character and extent of this natural knowledge? It may be stated in this way. By means of our natural faculties, aided by the Spirit of God, we are enabled to rise to the highest conception of Him. We are enabled to contemplate Him as the Creator and also as the Ruler of the world. Nor only so, we can also know a great deal about Him; St. Paul specifies two points as especially made out by our natural faculties, and they are most comprehensive, viz. His eternal power and Godhead. So far our natural faculties will carry us; and no doubt it is a great way. But here it is that they stop short. And what is most remarkable is, that the point at which they stop is just the point where we are introduced to, and feel ourselves in the presence of, some of the most awful and momentous questions that can occur to a human being. For when we have come to see that there must be an intelligent Being who is the Author and Ruler of the world, we are impelled to ask further: What is His personal character? Is He a God of vengeance or of mercy? Or, is He anything to us? Will He stoop to us, or is He indifferent? Does He behold or ignore us? Will He hear us if we call upon Him? Will He enter into relations with us and be our God? Will He be a Father to us? Or is He a Stranger or an Enemy? These are questions which touch the inmost core of the human heart, and have a momentous bearing on human destiny. And yet upon one and all of them our natural knowledge of God is silent—hopelessly silent. In fact, only those who have most deeply studied this natural knowledge know how hopeless this silence really is. And probably it is just this defect, which, taken along with perplexing indications, reacts upon the knowledge itself, scattering doubt everywhere, and in the end, where there is no other support, leading to that state of mind which is called Agnosticism.

Now, it is just at the point where natural knowledge stops short that revealed knowledge comes in, and it addresses itself to the solution of those questions which natural knowledge raises but is unable to grapple with. But there is more in it than this. It is not only that revealed knowledge goes

further than natural knowledge, but that it transports us into a wholly different sphere. Natural knowledge belongs to the sphere of abstract or scientific truth ; its essence is logic or reason. It is something that can be stated in propositions and proved by inferences. Hence it is not only hard and dry, but it is dead. There is no nutriment in it. There is nothing on which the soul hungering after and reaching forth to higher things can sustain itself. Our revealed knowledge, on the other hand, is living and personal. It transports us into the sphere of personal intercourse. It puts us face to face with God, and through it we are permitted to behold God unveiling Himself, exhibiting to us, as it were, His personal character and attitude towards us. We can read in these manifestations of God His everlasting love and condescension, His righteousness, justice, and judgment on sin, and at the same time His forgivingness, His mercy, and loving-kindness. In a word, revealed knowledge belongs to the same sphere as our own spiritual life—the sphere of personal intercourse with our God and Father. And hence we see how indispensable it is to the wellbeing of mankind, and how impossible it is that it could ever be superseded by any advance in our natural knowledge. But for another reason it is well to bear in mind the different sphere in which it stands from natural knowledge. When we study the names of God, we must be careful not to take them in an abstract or scientific sense. This would be to take them out of that personal spiritual sphere to which they belong, and so to miss their true meaning and import.

We now turn to consider with Mr. Jukes the particular names of God. The first with which he deals, and which was also the first name under which God revealed Himself, is Elohim. It is said in the text-books to be the first and most general designation of God ; but this is to take it in an abstract or scientific sense, which is out of harmony with the genius of revelation. We may first of all notice that it contrasts with the older name of God which was common to the Hebrews with the other Shemitic peoples ; we mean the name El, which means to be strong, to be powerful. It is clear that El as a name of God was common among the ancestors of the revelation people. We gather this from the fact of its frequently occurring in the earliest names, as for instance Mehujael, Methusael. It also continued to be used as a name of God by the sacred writers, although to a great extent supplanted by the new name Elohim. Mr. Jukes instances two hundred and twenty-five times where it is translated God in the



Authorized Version. It also appears in the names or titles of God, El Shaddai, El Olam, El Eljon. What then is the relation in which Elohim stands to this older name? It is probable there is a connexion between the two, if not direct at least indirect. But the attempt to trace the two words back as varying forms of the same root—in other words, to assign to Elohim a natural or traditional origin—fails. There is against it, first the fact that Elohim is a new name, peculiar to the sphere of revelation; and secondly, the fact that it possesses what, for want of a better word, we may call an artificial character. There is an additional letter in Elohim which on the above theory is quite unaccounted for, which in fact cannot be explained except by a reference to the analogous custom of the time. A similar change was effected in the original name of Abraham; an additional letter was introduced; and we know that it was done on purpose in order that the name might acquire a new meaning. Analogy leads us to the conclusion that the name Elohim was similarly constructed that it also might carry a special meaning.

Mr. Jukes adopts the etymology given in Parkhurst's Lexicon, which derives the word Elohim from the Hebrew word 'Alah,' to swear. Elohim would thus describe 'One who stands in a covenant relationship which is ratified by an oath.' Parkhurst says:—

'It is a name usually given in the Hebrew Scriptures to the ever-blessed Trinity by which they represent themselves as under the obligation of an oath . . . This oath (referred to in Psalm cx. 4, "The Lord swore and will not repent") was prior to creation. Accordingly "Jehovah" is at the beginning of the creation called "Elohim" in Gen. i. 1, which implies that the Divine persons had sworn when they created; and it is evident, from Gen. iii. 4-5, that both the serpent and the woman knew "Jehovah" by this name "Elohim" before the fall.'

This etymology derives considerable support from the fact pointed out by Mr. Jukes that all throughout the Old Testament the name Elohim is constantly associated with the idea of covenant relationship, and that it means, in fact, 'One in covenant.' It may be further remarked that if we adopt it, it accounts for all the facts. We see at once why Elohim is a new name, and why it is peculiar to revelation. It also puts Elohim in the same line with the other names of God as a product of revelation. If we find that the other names and appellatives of God are specially constructed for the purpose of expressing an aspect or attribute of God, there would be something quite incongruous in assigning to Elohim,



the first and most important of all, a natural or traditional origin.

What then is the special truth regarding God embodied in this name? It reveals the infinite love and condescension of God. God, as it were, unveils or lays bare His inmost heart or essence, and thereby encourages man to draw near to Him. By this name He assures man that He is love—unfailing love. God loves man, and because of this His love He is ever ready to enter into covenant with him, to take man for His child or servant, and to be to man his Elohim. The unfailing character of this love is expressed by the fact that it leads to or ends in a covenant—a covenant confirmed by an oath. Because it is a covenant, and because it is so confirmed, man knows that it never can be broken, at least on God's part. It is thus a pledge or assurance from God that He will never leave us or forsake us. Man knows from this name that, however forsaken or afflicted he may be, he has One on whom he can trust; however much he may have been unfaithful and wandered out of the way, yet his Elohim remains faithful, He cannot deny Himself. He can therefore always return from his wanderings with the full assurance that he will be heard and received in love. We have, in truth, in Elohim a foreshadow of that fuller revelation under the Christian covenant of God as love. It is the name Elohim that points with no uncertain indication to the perfect name of Father; for in this idea of covenant relationship there is summed up a father's care and providence, together with love that never fails.

And this is the first name of God. We shall see presently that, in order that we may have a full knowledge of God, it was necessary that God should reveal other attributes or sides of His Being, attributes of a sterner and more awful character. There is thus something unspeakably blessed in the fact that Elohim should be the first name—that it should lie behind and cover the others. Man is thereby enabled to appeal as it were from judgment or justice to the everlasting covenant of love embodied in Elohim.

Mr. Jukes finds illustrations of the name Elohim taken from those parts of Scripture where this name is specially used. We can only briefly indicate what they are, and leave the reader to follow them out. The most remarkable of all is, of course, the account of creation, where the name Elohim is exclusively used. That name thus throws a beautiful light upon the great creative act, signalizing it as an act of love. This lets us see what a blessing we possess in having such a

revelation. We have only to contrast this beautiful picture with the heathen systems of India or Persia to see its immense value. It would appear that man is especially liable to error in the view he takes of nature and its origin. Nor does the progress of culture mend the matter, or enable the human spirit to rise to juster or more perfect views. It would seem just the contrary. We have only to call to mind recent speculations—dark, even lurid, certainly perverted and hopeless—to see that the word of revelation is just as much needed at the present moment as it ever was. We turn with a shudder from these perversions to the clear and beautiful light which that wonderful first chapter sheds upon nature and its origin. Mr. Jukes finds in the description of the primitive state of the earth, as being 'without form and void,' an indication of a fall from a former state of perfection; and uses this as an illustration of the character of Elohim, who never forsakes the creature. Whether it be that the primeval void was owing to such a fall, or whether it were that it had not as yet received its form, the character of Elohim is manifested in the going forth of the Word and the Spirit, and the majestic process, step by step, by which order, beauty, and life are introduced, and finally man is created in the image of Elohim. Out of darkness light is produced; out of disorder, order; nor does the Creator cease from work till all is perfected, all is made beautiful, and everything is pronounced to be good. It may be that we have here, as Mr. Jukes thinks, an image and type of that marvellous work of regeneration and renewal by which man, though fallen, is not deserted by Elohim, but is brought back, step by step, to the perfect image of the Creator.

We have, again, in the case of the Flood an instance of the unfailing love of Elohim. Here, undoubtedly, we have a fall with ruin and disorder everywhere. Yet Elohim does not turn away. Just because of His love which brings Him into covenant with man, He cannot and will not forsake him, fallen though he be. A way of salvation must be provided, and hence Noah is elected and the ark prepared. What is most interesting in connexion with Noah is to see how closely the idea of covenant relationship is connected with Elohim. 'And Elohim said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me, but with thee will I establish my covenant.'<sup>1</sup> And again, 'And behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed, and with every living creature that is with you. And this is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you. I do set my bow in the cloud, and I will remember

<sup>1</sup> Gen. vi. 13, 18.

my  
crea  
case  
Elo  
cove  
wall  
cove  
gen  
be t

ever  
love  
prot  
Isra  
wou  
not  
thro  
sure  
won  
whic  
'My  
out o  
cove  
him  
For,  
all th

E  
the a  
man.  
have  
we h  
know  
absor  
perso  
us.  
He i  
find  
perpl  
but a  
them  
answ  
revel  
veils  
and t

VO

my covenant which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.' So, again, in the case of Abraham we find a similar association of the name Elohim with the covenant. Elohim makes with Abraham a covenant which is to last for ever. 'I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect: and I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in all generations, to be a God to thee and to thy seed, and I will be their Elohim.'<sup>1</sup>

We thus see how the name Elohim is associated with the everlasting covenant, and how it is a pledge of the unfailing love of God and that He will never withdraw His care and protection. In this way the name sank deep into the heart of Israel. The Israelite knew that, whatever might betide, God would be true and He would remember His covenant. Had not God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the overthrow? Was not Jacob sure when dying that 'Elohim will surely visit you, and bring you out of this land'? There is a wonderful beauty in the way in which this revelation light which clings to the name Elohim is reflected in the Psalms. 'My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.' And again, 'He will ever be mindful of His covenant.' And again, of David, 'My mercy will I keep with him for ever, and my covenant shall stand fast with him.' For, as David says, 'it is an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure.'

Elohim, then, is the earliest revelation of God. It expresses the attitude or aspect in which God first unveils Himself to man. And in order to understand it in all its blessedness we have only to set it over against that knowledge of God which we have by our natural faculties. We have seen that this knowledge breaks off just at the point which is of the most absorbing interest to us. It cannot tell us anything of God personally, of His character, His feelings, His attitude towards us. It cannot even tell us whether He beholds, or whether He ignores us. Those who rely solely on natural knowledge find themselves at the end of their labours in a state of utter perplexity and doubt. They would fain know more of God, but as it was in the case of the priests of Baal so it is with them. There is in natural knowledge 'no voice nor any to answer.' It is in contrast with this that all the blessedness of revelation is felt. God as it were breaks the silence; He unveils Himself; He exhibits His inmost essence and character, and that is beautiful beyond expression. He is the God of love,

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xvii. 1.

the God of the everlasting covenant ; of His care and protection there is no end ; neither will He leave us or forsake us.

Before passing from the name Elohim there is a point of some interest on which we should like to say a word. As is well known, the name Elohim is a plural. But though a plural it is, with very rare exceptions, always construed with the singular. This fact, in view of the subsequent revelation of the mystery of the Trinity, is most remarkable ; and naturally the old theologians saw in it a foreshadowing of, or at least a preparation for, the fuller revelation. Mr. Jukes adopts the old view and appeals in support of it to many passages which on the face of them seem to demand the idea of a plurality in God. The same God who emphatically affirms His unity, saying, 'There is no God beside me,' and 'I am God and there is none else,' says also 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ;' and again, 'The man is become like one of us ;' and again, at Babel, 'Go to, let us go down and confound their language.' Mr. Jukes points out that there are many other passages hidden from the English reader in which the same plurality is indicated or implied. For instance, 'Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth,' is literally 'Remember thy Creators ;' and in Proverbs we have, 'The knowledge of the Holy Ones is understanding.' Certainly it is difficult on a consideration of these passages to avoid the conclusion that, along with the unity of God, a plurality in His Being or essence is shadowed forth. And it is especially difficult for those who, on other grounds, are convinced that the Bible is a record of real revelations. And yet in modern times the idea has been set aside, almost without examination, as something fanciful and anachronistic.

The curious thing, however, is that the progress of discussion has led us back exactly to the point from which we started, with just this difference, that the plurality in God accepted formerly on faith is now presented to us as an undeniable result of knowledge. This will be seen if we look at some of the modes in which the plural in Elohim has been explained, for obviously we have here a fact which must be accounted for.

First we have the view that the plural is a survival of a previous state of things when Polytheism prevailed. Just as the Greeks and Romans spoke of 'the gods,' so the ancestors of the revelation people spoke of 'the Elohim ;' and this mode of expression, we are assured, survived when Monotheism was developed out of Polytheism. It is sufficient to say of this theory that it has not a shred of evidence to support it. Like

so many other theories of what is called criticism, it rests solely on the support of a vivid imagination. If such a revolution in religious faith took place, it must have occurred at a period so remote that all trace of it had vanished long before the revelation era began. It may therefore be dismissed as an unsupported conjecture, and all the more readily as it stands in flagrant contradiction with the whole genius of the revelation faith. Another view put forward is that the plural is used for the purpose of including with the Supreme God the higher angels or spirits who are supposed to form, as it were, His court. But the account of creation, where the plural Elohim is uniformly used, shows no trace of the co-operation of angels. The creation is the work of God by His Word and Spirit; nor is it reconcilable with the revelation idea of God that any created being could be associated with Him. Others, again, have supposed that we have in Elohim the plural of majesty; but as an explanation this breaks down, because, though it might very well explain some cases, it is quite inapplicable to others. Thus we come to an explanation which has recently been put forth, and is, we believe, now extensively adopted. It is a view which really carries with it great probability. It is said that in order to explain the use of the plural Elohim we must place it side by side with other similar plurals occurring in Hebrew, as, for instance, the waters, the heavens. This is what is called the quantitative plural, and it is employed for the purpose of expressing unlimited greatness. If we suppose that we have in Elohim such a plural, the explanation of its use would be this. Just as the Jew used the plural number to express the vastness of the ocean or the heavens, so he used Elohim to denote the fulness and infinity which is in God. Such is the most probable view, and by many it is held to be a sufficient explanation.

In reality, however, the matter cannot rest so. There is still something further that needs explanation, and in explaining it we are just led back to the old theological view. For the quantitative plural cannot be used unless there is a real plurality in the object to which it is applied. There is such a plurality in the waters and the heavens, and if Elohim is a case of this plural we must look for a similar plurality in God. But how are we to conceive this plurality in God? That is the point which must be explained. God is not, like the waters and the heavens, an extended divisible entity; consequently we cannot think the manifold in Him in the same way in which we see it to exist in them. Still that a manifold does exist in Him, and was perceived to exist by the organs of

revelation, the use of the plural bears witness. We are thus, as it were, driven to conceive it in the sense of the later revelation, which is the only way in which it can be thought. In truth, the plural Elohim, taken in connexion with what is said of the Word and the Spirit in the early writings, gives a real foundation for the doctrine of the Trinity afterwards revealed.

When we turn from the name Elohim to that of Jehovah, we are conscious of a striking change. We feel that we have in this name another side or aspect of the Infinite God unveiled and presented to us. It is not, indeed, an altogether different side, for it is grounded on the former, and blends and coalesces with it. Jehovah grows out of Elohim, and is one with it; and this unity is expressed in the compound name Jehovah-Elohim under which God is presented in the earliest writings. The ground of this new name is to be found in what had happened. Man had fallen; man had changed his attitude towards God, and this involved a new attitude towards man on the part of God. The name Jehovah embodies this new attitude. It expresses the unchanging righteousness and holiness of God. It represents God as one who loves righteousness and hates iniquity; therefore as one who must judge evil wherever it exists, and, as Mr. Jukes beautifully expresses it, 'at whatever cost whether to the creature or Creator.'

In regard to the etymology of the name Jehovah there is no room for dispute. It cannot be denied that this is a new name artificially constructed, a special product of revelation. It is a noun formed from the third person of the imperfect of Havah, to be; and the meaning is 'One who is what He is,' or 'I am that I am;' in the Vulgate 'Ego sum qui sum.' In our opinion it is quite wrong to give to this an abstract, general, or scientific import. For instance, it is said by Oehler:—

'It is not the notion of a lasting being which lies in the verb Havah, but that of a moving existence, of becoming and occurring. . . . Hence it is wrong to find in the name the abstract notion of *ὄντως ὄν*. God is rather Jahve in as far as He has entered into historical relationship to mankind, and shows Himself continually in this historical relationship as He who is what He is. While heathenism rests almost exclusively on the past revelations of divinities, this name testifies, on the one hand, that the relationship of God to the world is in a state of continual living activity; it testifies especially in reference to the people who address their God by this name that they have in their God a future.'<sup>1</sup>

We admit that it is wrong to find in the name Jehovah the abstract notion of *ὄντως ὄν*; but it is equally wrong to find

<sup>1</sup> *Theology of the Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 139.

in it  
the wo  
latter  
of the  
of rev  
tract  
The n  
presen  
what t  
that I  
change  
and th  
of the  
Mr. Ju  
of Jeh

'Le  
these t  
self is p  
ferent  
Jehova  
lutely  
righteo  
this. "I  
the Be  
hended  
and mu  
see how  
self-sar  
If we t  
cause  
think o  
or seem  
loved  
illustra  
failings  
pression  
If ther  
unfaith  
pain yo  
counte

Th  
The sa  
The o  
differ  
loved  
of God  
attitud



in it the expression of the historical relationship of God to the world as involving a future, however true in itself this latter point may be. To explain the name Jehovah in either of these ways is to take it out of that personal spiritual sphere of revelation into a totally different one, namely, that of abstract knowledge, and thereby quite to miss its real import. The name must express a side, or aspect, or attitude of God presented in revelation. Nor is there any difficulty in seeing what that attitude must be. In unfolding Himself as 'I am that I am,' Elohim, as it were, says: 'If man changes, yet I change not. I am, and must remain true to that which I am, and that is righteousness, holiness, truth.' It is the revelation of the attitude of God in view of the fall and sin of man. And Mr. Jukes shows in a striking way how the name and attitude of Jehovah grow out of Elohim:—

'Let me try to show more exactly what the difference between these two names is, and how the One unchanging God, who in Himself is perfect Love, may, as we apprehend Him, appear in very different aspects or characters, either as Love or Truth as Elohim or Jehovah. St. John tells us "God is love." This is what He absolutely is. But in the expression of love we may see that love is righteous also. As to His Being, God is Love, and "Elohim" declares this. "Jehovah" reveals Him as the Truth; and Truth is not so much the Being of God as the Expression of His Being. And as apprehended by us these appear different, though in themselves they are and must be one. Some may not yet see this. But all, I think, will see how Love must show itself in truth and righteousness. Thus the self-same Love in its Being and in its Expression may seem different. If we think of its Being, we shall see a will which cannot change, because it springs from and rests on being and relationship. If we think of its Expression, we shall see how variously it acts, and changes, or seems to change, in virtue of certain qualities or conduct in the loved one. A father's and still more a mother's unchanging love illustrates the first, a love which cannot change, spite of faults and failings in the loved one. This is love in its Being. But the Expression of this love varies in virtue of certain qualities in the beloved. If therefore a child rebels, or a friend deceives, or if a wife becomes unfaithful, there will be a breach of love. You must, much as it may pain you, part from them, and judge the evil; for if you do not, you countenance their evil doings' (p. 36).

Thus the name Jehovah is fundamentally one with Elohim. The same love which is revealed in Elohim appears in Jehovah. The only thing different is the expression of this love, and this difference arises from the changed conduct or attitude of the loved one. What the name Jehovah indicates is that the love of God must be a righteous love. Jehovah must regard the attitude and conduct of His creature. His love being righteous,



He must look for righteousness in the creature, and if the creature falls into sin, there must be a breach. Jehovah must judge and punish the evil. Yet while He judges and punishes He Himself also suffers. This latter point Mr. Jukes brings out very beautifully, and finds in it a foreshadow of the cross of Christ.

As illustrations of the name of Jehovah Mr. Jukes refers to the history of Paradise, to the judgment of the Flood, to the giving of the Law; and especially to the pictures given in the Prophets and reflected in the Psalms. If we refer to Paradise, we see how, at the very beginning, Jehovah regards the conduct of the creature and looks for righteousness. He makes for man a beautiful Paradise, and as soon as he is placed in it puts him under law. His command is laid upon man in the words 'Thou shalt' and 'Thou shalt not;' and there is the possibility of man not obeying, for in Paradise there is not only the tree of life, but also the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Then when man prefers the word of the serpent to the command of his Lord and falls into sin, Jehovah is revealed in judgment. He judges and punishes the sin, expelling man from Paradise. We have in the case of the Flood a similar illustration of Jehovah. Here Mr. Jukes goes somewhat into detail, showing that the interchange of the names Jehovah and Elohim, which takes place in the narrative, really has a meaning. Jehovah is used in reference to that righteousness which He expects and which He found in Noah, and also in reference to the judgment itself, because of the wickedness of man which was great upon the earth. Elohim, on the other hand, is used in reference to the salvation by the ark and the promise of the covenant. But it is in the giving of the law, and the history connected with it, that we have the fullest illustration. Here the materials are so ample that we cannot even abbreviate, and must content ourselves with two quotations in which the whole is summed up. First we see how Jehovah speaks as One who loves righteousness and requires His own image in His people. It is said: 'Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is One Jehovah. And thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.'<sup>1</sup> Then again we have the promises and the threatenings according as Israel obeys or disobeys. 'And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently to my commandments, to love Jehovah your God, and to serve Him with all your heart, that I will give you the rain of your land in due season, that thou mayest gather in thy corn and wine and oil.'<sup>2</sup> 'But if ye will

<sup>1</sup> Deut. vi. 4, 5.<sup>2</sup> Deut. xi. 13.

not obey the voice of Jehovah, but rebel against His commandments, then shall the hand of Jehovah be against you, as it was against your fathers.<sup>1</sup>

As a specimen of the representation of the Prophets we may quote Ezekiel : ' If a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, and hath walked in my statutes, and kept my judgments, he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord Jehovah . . . but he that doeth not any of these duties . . . he shall surely die, his blood shall be upon him.'<sup>2</sup> The whole prophetic representation of Jehovah may in fact be summed up in two sentences : ' I have loved you with an everlasting love,' and ' The soul that sinneth it shall die.' It is the same also in the Psalms.

Mr. Jukes gives the following representation of the suffering of Jehovah as foreshadowing the Cross :—

' Again and again, when Israel sinned, "the anger of Jehovah was kindled against His people, and Jehovah sold them into the hands of their enemies;" but it is not Israel only that is "sore distressed;" for of Jehovah also it is written, "And His soul was grieved for the misery of Israel."<sup>3</sup> So again the Prophet declares, "Behold, I am pressed under you, as a cart is pressed that is full of sheaves,"<sup>4</sup> that is, He is pressed and burdened, and goes groaning. So again the psalmist says, "Forty years long was I grieved with this generation in the wilderness."<sup>5</sup> "In all their afflictions He was afflicted."<sup>6</sup> Who can measure the anguish of His words : "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? My heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together."<sup>7</sup> We are slow to see all this; and yet if Jesus Christ really reveals "Jehovah;" if He is indeed the brightness of His glory and the express image of His Person; if He is, as the Apostle says, the image of the invisible God; then His Cross and sufferings show, not only that sin brings death and sorrow upon men, but (if we may say it) sorrow and trouble on "Jehovah." Christ's cross is the witness of "Jehovah's" cross, though by His cross He conquers all' (p. 51).

There is only one other point needed to complete the picture of Jehovah, and we refer to it briefly. It is that revelation of Him which comes out in the later Prophets, which embodies a foreshadow of the New Testament. Jehovah loves righteousness, and requires righteousness, and judges and punishes the evil. But He does not end here. That which the later Prophets reveal is that His dealings with His people

<sup>1</sup> 1 Sam. xii. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Ezek. xviii. 5-9.

<sup>3</sup> Judges x. 6, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Amos ii. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. xcvi. 10.

<sup>6</sup> Isa. lxiii. 9.

<sup>7</sup> Hos. xi. 8.

do not end till He makes them righteous with His own righteousness. Hence He becomes in Jeremiah 'The Lord our righteousness;' and the new covenant that He is to make with them after those days is a covenant under which He will put His law into their mind and will write it in their heart. All this, which was dark and doubtful to the Jew of old, comes out clear under the New Testament. It is the ministration of righteousness which exceeds in glory.

We have occupied so much space with the consideration of the first two names, that we are unable to follow Mr. Jukes in the others. Yet they are of great interest. Foremost among them is El Shaddai, which forms the complement of Elohim and Jehovah. El Shaddai is the Almighty God; but, as Mr. Jukes points out, God is Almighty, not under the popular view because He can do anything and everything, but Almighty by the power of His grace. El Shaddai is the shedder forth; and the name thus becomes the ground and foreshadow of the Pentecostal gift, and of the gift of the Eucharist. For it is the communication of Himself that is shadowed forth under this name. We take leave of Mr. Jukes, and can recommend his beautiful volume. The only criticism we would make is that the reader will find in it a slight admixture of the doctrine for which he is famed. But that is a small thing in view of the excellent matter with which the volume abounds.

---

### ART. III.—CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY AND LITERATURE.

*A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Heresies: being a Continuation of the Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and HENRY WACE, D.D. Four volumes. (London, 1877-1887.)

THE completion of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* at length perfects the trilogy it forms along with the *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*. They attest conjointly that principle of continuity which differentiates the Catholic view of Church history from the Protestant

one, and indeed from the Ultramontane. And they do it all the more effectually because they are not intentionally designed to subserve this purpose; nay, not a few of the many contributors are obviously pledged to the opposite view, and there is, to say the least, no clear evidence of editorial correction of any such bias on their part. The usefulness of this series of volumes is indisputable, and no one who is occupied with the class of questions with which they are concerned can henceforward dispense with their aid; while the scholar who is often so occupied must have them for his very own, and not merely consult them occasionally in some public library. Nevertheless, this usefulness has its limits. Not only have these dictionaries the fault of very unequal treatment inseparable from all literary co-operation, but the period covered by their issue has been a very active one in just the fields of learning with which they deal, so that in not a few instances the best recent scholarship has left the conclusions arrived at behind, and requiring revision to bring them up to date. A graver defect is a necessary result of the arbitrary break made at the end of the eighth century, beyond which the two latter dictionaries of the series refuse to carry us. For there is no such break in the actual current of Church history and Church life, and the student is as much concerned to know what happened in the twelfth or the fifteenth century as what happened in the seventh. As regards this last work of the series, it concerns him much more; for the writers and great ecclesiastics of the Plantagenet era (to employ a note of time convenient for Englishmen) are incomparably more eminent and influential than all, save half-a-dozen at most, between Gregory the Great and Charlemagne. *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* where we shall look in vain for Paschasius Radbert, Rabanus Maurus, Walafrid Strabo, Photius, Scotus Erigena, Fulbert of Chartres, Notker Balbulus, Lanfranc, Gregory VII., Godfrey de Bouillon, Anselm, Becket, Abelard, Innocent III., Hugh of St. Victor, Thomas Aquinas, and a crowd of others, does but very imperfectly fulfil the promise of its title, and scholars will not have all they imperatively need till this want is supplied. A like remark applies, but to a much less serious extent, to the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*; but even there the student whose immediate business is to trace the history of some rite or usage is apt to be baffled by the sudden interruption of the record when the era of Charlemagne is reached.

Another criticism which forces itself on the attention is that the classification of this last *Dictionary* has not been

carefully maintained. Besides the biographical articles, and those on literature, sects, and heresies, which the title-page promises, there are a great many entries which do not properly fall under any of these categories, and which should have found their place in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*. Such, for instance, are Baptism, Confession, Confirmation, Eucharist, Excommunication, Monasteries of Nitria, Patron Saints and Angels, &c. These articles are more or less avowedly addenda to the earlier dictionary, and, even on the theory of their being more literary and bibliographical than archæological, ought to have found their place therein, for it is not convenient to the student that he should have to search in different works for two such closely allied branches of a given subject, since it may be quite as much his object to ascertain what has been written elsewhere as to examine the article here supplied him. It is desirable, therefore, when the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* goes out of print, and a new edition is required, that these and similar entries in the present work should be incorporated therein, and dropped out of the next edition of the present dictionary. The space so gained is not likely to remain unoccupied for lack of claimants.

As compared with the two great contemporary dictionaries of a kindred nature—the Roman Catholic *Kirchen-Lexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, and the Protestant *Real-Encyclopädie* of Herzog and Plitt—the book before us gains or loses by comparison according to the point of view. Concerned as it is with a smaller range of topics, it is fuller within that range; the treatment is more detailed, the probability of getting some measure of information about minor personages, whose relative obscurity would lead to their omission where space is a main consideration, is greater; and of course there is special attention given to topics having some direct bearing upon English Church history, which are more cursorily handled in foreign compilations. On the other hand, those other works are far more comprehensive, they meet the needs of the general theological student much more fully, they cover a longer and wider historical area, and they are more evenly level in execution. English theological literature is still without any work, whether on the larger scale of those just named, or the much smaller one of the Abbé Glaire's *Dictionnaire Universel des Sciences Ecclésiastiques* (2 vols. royal 8vo, Paris, 1868), which will fairly meet the needs of a student who can afford to purchase but few books, and desires to find within the compass of but one, and that of moderate dimensions, the

information he is seeking upon a variety of allied topics. The French book just mentioned, for example, claims on its title-page to be a handbook to the history of religion and of the Church, ecclesiastical discipline, liturgies, dogmatic and moral theology, Biblical exegesis, canon law, hagiography, popes, councils, ancient and modern episcopal sees—this reminds us that we have not yet a dictionary of Christian geography—abbey, religious and military orders, schisms, heresies, religious biography and bibliography. That is a sufficiently comprehensive programme, and yet it is much more nearly carried out than might be supposed. Of course the book has the defects as well as the merits of French work, and, above all, French theological work. The articles upon questions of criticism are perfunctory and inadequate, but the amount of really trustworthy information on many subjects, given in very brief form, is remarkable. It might reasonably be taken for granted, for instance, that such a book, compiled by a French Ultramontane, would ignore English theological literature as a whole, and refer to it only where it collided polemically or conferred amicably with the writings of French divines. We might thus, perhaps, look for Andrewes and for Wake; we might also expect, on historical grounds, to find Cranmer and Parker; but scarcely for more than such exceptional entries. But, in point of fact, there is a large contingent of English writers, and, what is more, equipped with a very useful bibliography of their theological publications. Nothing in the least resembling this work is procurable in English; the revised edition of Dean Hook's *Church Dictionary* and Mr. Benham's *Dictionary of Religion*, both useful in their degree, do not cover at all the same amount of ground, and are much less varied in the treatment of the far smaller group of subjects with which they deal. Here, then, is a field to be occupied. Already we have an abridged edition of the *Bible Dictionary* in Dr. William Smith's series, and there seems no reason why we should not have a book which shall present an abridgment of the two companion works, with the addition of the other subjects to be found in the Abbé Glaire's volumes, all brought down to the present day, instead of breaking off more than a thousand years ago. Competently edited, and rivalling the French compilation in plan, method, arrangement, and contents, while surpassing it in width of outlook and in accuracy and range of scholarship, it would meet a serious want, and should obtain a brilliant success, if brought, alike in compass and in cost, within the reach of those who dwell in narrow rooms, and carry but shallow purses.



In proceeding to form an impartial estimate of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, it is necessary to take first into account the editors' exposition of its scope and aim, as set forth in the preface to the first volume, published in 1877. The two questions which will then need consideration are: How far is the plan itself to be commended as adequate in conception? and How far is the execution commensurate with the plan? We are told, in the first place, that the present work is intended to be a continuation of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, and to furnish, in biographical form, in union with the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, a complete collection of materials for the history of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne, both these works being parts of one comprehensive cyclopædia of ecclesiastical history for the first eight centuries of the Christian era, and everything subsequent to Charlemagne being omitted as belonging to the domain of modern history. Abandoning the idea of producing a complete Onomasticon of the Christian world, because of the delay it must occasion, the scheme of the editors has been to take the great historical collections made since the Reformation as their starting-point, to verify, collate, and condense them into manageable compass, thus advancing the work of former scholars a step forwards, to apply correctively the resources of modern learning, and to increase the scale of treatment in respect of articles relating to England, Scotland, and Ireland. Acknowledging the inequality observable in the earlier part of vol. i. as compared with the latter, they account for it by the gradual evolution of plan, and by the long period over which the preparation of the work extended, so that in not a few cases fresh information came to light after the first portion of the work was printed. All such defects they undertake to make good in a supplement, to be published after the issue of the dictionary in a provisionally complete form.

In the main, this is a broad, scholarly, and judicious scheme, and it has, on the whole, been fairly carried out. But we take exception to the sentence in the preface which runs: 'It ceases at the age of Charlemagne, because the reign of that monarch forms a recognized link between ancient and modern times.' Now, while this statement is true in some sense of secular history, it does not hold good of ecclesiastical history. The Alcuins and Bedes of the Carolingian period do not usher in a new era; they are a flicker of the dying lamp of the elder learning, and a period of intellectual barbarism, extending over two centuries, but dimly lighted by such



scholars as some of those named above as not included within the scope of this dictionary, set in immediately after the death of the great Emperor. The new active Church life which begins the modern era may perhaps best be dated from the first prominence of Hildebrand in the sphere of ecclesiastical polity, and of Lanfranc in that of scholastic theology, both of whom almost exactly synchronize with the final breach between Oriental and Latin Christianity, just after the middle of the eleventh century; and it is to this point, or at any rate but just short of it, that a cyclopædia of ancient Christian history and literature should come down, even on the hypothesis we have already disputed, that any such division as that between ancient and modern can be philosophically drawn at all, where the action is so continuous and the conservative elements, on the whole, so powerful throughout. In truth, the division which most accords with the facts of both secular and ecclesiastical history is to date the mediæval period from the break-up of the Western Empire in 479, and the modern from the fall of Constantinople in 1453. And we think it would have been wiser to have held back the articles we have specified as foreign to the immediate subject of this dictionary, reserving them for the promised Supplement—which might well be extended to the *Dictionary of the Bible* also—and so complement the whole series, permanently for possessors of the original issue, and provisionally in respect of future editions, to which all supplemental matter should be systematically and severally transferred upon every occasion of reprinting.

Having premised so much concerning the general scope and method of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, we shall now turn to the question of its execution, and will endeavour to enable our readers, by means of a sufficient induction of specimen articles, to form a trustworthy estimate of its quality.

The first article to signalize is 'Abdias,' by Professor Lipsius of Jena, a scholarly and adequate analysis of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, attributed to a legendary Bishop of Babylon, but really of Western and Latin origin at some uncertain date between the translation of Eusebius by Rufinus, about 399, and the poems of Venantius Fortunatus two hundred years later; these limits being fixed by the obvious use made of Rufinus by the pseudo-Abdias, and of the pseudo-Abdias himself by Venantius Fortunatus. The article is dry, no doubt, but that is quite as much to be ascribed to the subject as to the writer, who is far more readable in the

extremely full and valuable article on the general subject of the apocryphal Acts, which follows close upon it. But we wish Professor Lipsius had gone somewhat more minutely into the Simon Magus legend at Rome, on which he touches, indeed, but without showing how and when the scene of the legendary contest between him and St. Peter was transferred from the East, where it was at first localised, to the West. This is a point of some historical interest, since no fewer than three of the very scanty pre-Nicene references to St. Peter in connexion with the city of Rome are concerned with that story alone, and when withdrawn, as they needs must be, seriously diminish the bulk of testimony now extant upon that matter. Provost Salmon's article on 'Julius Africanus' is excellent, omitting nothing which the reader is concerned to know, or reasonably entitled to look for in a book of reference. This scarcely holds good of the Bishop of Chester's article upon 'Alcuin,' for, sound and scholarly as it is, a student might justifiably ask for more particulars as to the educational labours of Alcuin, whose share was so large in promoting the school-system encouraged, if not actually planned, by Charlemagne. And the problem of Alcuin's relation to the *Libri Carolini* deserved more than the single sentence, in which it is just mentioned to be passed over. No doubt it is beset with polemical thorns, requiring judicious handling in a non-controversial work, but it is of sufficient literary importance to merit investigation and exposition. Canon Bright's 'St. Alexander of Alexandria' is a good example of compressing a long story into brief compass without loss of lucidity, and the difficulties of the narrative are succinctly cleared up, especially that arising from the curious statement of Eutychius as to the mode of appointing to the patriarchate of Alexandria. Under 'Ambrosiaster,' by Professor Westcott, and 'Ambrosius of Mediolanum,' by Mr. Llewelyn Davies, there is nothing said as to the authorship of the treatise *De Sacramentis*, which is simply assumed to be a work of St. Ambrose; but as its authenticity has been challenged, and its date brought down three, and even four, centuries later by able critics, the question should have been discussed in one or other of these articles, and the name of Ambrose of Cahors in the eighth century should have been given as its most probable author.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, its spuriousness is directly asserted further on, in the article 'Eucharist,' by Mr. E. S. Ffoulkes. The Bishop of Durham's 'St. Amphilochius' is an admirable piece of work, and the utmost is made of the relatively scanty

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccl.* tom. i. col. 1861.

and absolutely mutilated materials which exist for giving a faithful presentment of that eminent person.

Dean Plumptre's 'Angels' is rather thin, and, what is singular in so fervid a student of Dante, makes no reference whatever to the widely-spread belief, beginning, we think, with Origen, that there was a body of angels who attempted to stand neuter when Satan rebelled and fell. The passage in the third canto of the *Inferno* is just to the point:—

'Mischiare sono a quel cattivo coro  
Degli Angeli, che non furon ribelli,  
Nè fur fedeli a Dio, ma per sè foro.  
Cacciarli i Ciel, per non esser men belli,  
Nè lo profondo Inferno gli riceve,  
Ch' alcuna gloria i rei avrebber d'elli.'

'Antichrist,' by the same contributor, has the like fault of thinness, and needs to be rewritten before it can be called adequate. It is good so far as it goes, but there is not enough of it, nor is anything told us of the literary treatment of the subject later than the fifth century. The Bishop of Durham is again well to the front with a full and accurate account of St. Athanasius, and in respect of the scholarship of the subject nothing is lacking, but there is a certain coldness of tone which is a little out of keeping with the noble and inspiring topic, which might kindle almost any competent narrator into eloquence. It was a mistake to put St. Augustine into M. de Pressense's hands. He has been painstaking, even laboured, over his subject, but the nineteen columns devoted to it fail to supply an adequate picture of the man himself or a sufficient analysis of his writings. What he has failed to do for St. Augustine has been effected for St. Basil the Great by Canon Venables, whose article is a much more thorough piece of work. There is an error in the entry 'Boniface IV.,' where it is alleged that Clinton regards the letter of Columbanus to Boniface upon the controversy of the Three Chapters as unauthentic, which is not the case. This is a matter of some importance, for the superscription of the letter in question supplies valuable evidence of the estimate in which the Roman See was held by the Celtic Church, and of the personal relations of Columbanus to the Pope of his day. It begins thus: 'Pulcherrimo omnium totius Europæ ecclesiarum capiti, Papæ prædulci;' and in the document itself occurs the sentence: 'Nos enim, ut ante dixi, devincti sumus cathedræ S. Petri, licet enim Romæ est magna et vulgata, per istam cathedram tantum apud nos magna et clara. . . . Propter Christi geminos Apostolos

vos prope cælestes estis, et Roma orbis terrarum caput et ecclesiarum.' The article 'Columbanus' does not correct the error as to Clinton, for, without directly repeating it, it sends the reader back to the article 'Bonifacius IV.' by a cross-reference, thereby virtually affirming it anew. Professor Cowell's article on 'Buddha and Buddhism' has been carefully put together from the best authorities, old and new, and is a good summary of the subject. We may note in connexion with it that there is no mention under the article 'Barlaam' of the curious fact that the legend of Barlaam and Josaphat is the story of Buddha in a Christianized form. 'Charles the Great' is a useful but slightly heavy article, which might have been more picturesque with no loss to scholarly precision. The intricate problems connected with the 'Clementine Literature' are ably and adequately handled by Dr. Salmon, in one of the longer entries of the *Dictionary*. There is a compendious and accurate article on 'Confirmation' by Mr. E. S. Ffoulkes, but this is one of the entries which should be transferred to the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* on the first opportunity. Mr. Fuller's article on the 'Coptic Church' contains a mass of information, conveniently arranged, on a subject exceptionally unfamiliar to the ordinary student; but it will be the better for some re-touching in future editions, as more facts are known concerning it now, by reason of the political complications in Egypt, than were accessible at the date of the article. Canon Bright's 'Cyril of Alexandria' is one of the best among the biographical notices, and there has been no attempt to evade or gloss over the dark parts of the story, though no brief is held against the famous patriarch. 'Epiphanius of Salamis,' by Professor Lipsius, is another of the same stamp, and a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history. 'Eschatology,' by Dean Plumptre, is on lines similar to those of the volume entitled *The Spirits in Prison*, which he published in 1884, and is a most able and temperate statement of the controversy, leaning towards the 'larger hope' in its conclusions, and specifically rejecting the Augustinian view as having shed a 'disastrous twilight' for centuries over Christian thought upon this momentous subject. The writer says, very truly, that the indulgence system, with all its vices, was only a natural development of Augustinianism, and 'it was reserved for Calvinism and popular Protestantism to reproduce all that was hardest in it without even that element of mitigation.' Mr. Ffoulkes's short but sufficient article on the theological meaning of 'Eternity' may be conveniently read

188  
alon  
tion  
has  
duc  
from  
a p  
Eth  
of s  
term  
less,  
set  
form  
Litu  
illus  
C  
this  
Son  
as a  
J  
cause  
Thee  
A  
which  
irrefu  
E  
forth  
senten  
and c  
which  
for us  
bcdy.  
O  
follow  
serve  
deal  
himse  
Durha  
and c  
too m  
relatio  
the in  
the 'I  
posc.  
unavo  
juxtap  
VOL

along with this paper of Dean Plumptre's, whether for illustration or correction. Principal Reynolds, of Cheshunt College, has been intrusted with the 'Ethiopic Church,' and has produced an instructive paper upon it, but one not quite free from traces of polemical bias, as when he thinks he is making a point by remarking that in the most sacred part of an Ethiopic church there is 'the *table* of communion, not "altar" of sacrifice.' Clearly he does not know that 'table' is the term in use in all the Oriental liturgies, wherein, none the less, the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is prominently set forth, as we showed at some length in this *Review* in a former article ('The Sacrificial Teaching of the Ancient Liturgies,' October 1880), from which we take a couple of illustrative quotations to settle the present point:—

Greek St. James.— . . . 'I am not worthy to present myself before this Thy sacred and spiritual Table, where Thine Only-Begotten Son and our Lord, Jesus Christ, is mystically set forth (*πρόκειται*) as a Sacrifice for me, a sinner marked with every stain.'

*Ibid.* Prayer of the Incense.— . . . 'Purify us from every spot, and cause us to stand pure before Thy holy Altar, that we may offer to Thee the sacrifice of praise.'

And that the like doctrine is held by the very Church which Principal Reynolds views as rejecting it, can be shown irrefutably from its own most ancient rite:—

Ethiopic Universal Canon.—'Jesu Christ, our King, . . . shew forth Thy Face upon this Bread and on this Cup, which we have presented on this Thy spiritual altar. Bless, hallow, and purify them, and change this Bread that it may become Thy pure Body, and that which is mingled in this Cup Thy precious Blood, and let them be for us an Oblation unto healing, and to the salvation of our soul and body. . . .'

On the general issue, Mr. Ffoulkes's article on 'Eucharist,' following close on Principal Reynolds's contribution, will serve to correct it, though Mr. Ffoulkes does not specifically deal with the sacrificial element at any length, contenting himself with a few pregnant sentences. The Bishop of Durham's 'Eusebius of Cæsarea' is well-nigh exhaustive, and occupies almost forty pages of the *Dictionary*, yet not too much for the exceeding importance of the subject in relation to ecclesiastical history. Mr. Ffoulkes has essayed the impossible when attempting to compress an article on the 'Fathers' into the brief space allowed him for the purpose. He has produced, indeed, a readable essay, but it is unavoidably sketchy, and too crowded with names in close juxtaposition to be clear reading for tiros, though it is a

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIV.

X

sufficiently convenient summary to remind scholars of various salient facts in patrology. Tillemont and Natalis Alexander should be added to the bibliographical list at the end of the article, as more valuable aids by far than Rohrbacher and Alzog, who are recommended. The article 'God' is a weak and insufficient handling of the subject, whose literary difficulty and complexity are considerable, and needed an abler expositor than Professor Swainson. 'Apocryphal Gospels' is yet another of Professor Lipsius's profitable contributions to the *Dictionary*, and will amply repay perusal. Under 'Grace' we desiderate a larger Oriental factor in the treatment of the subject, St. Augustine's teaching being in sole possession. But while it is quite true that his minute discussion of this part of Christian theology has won for him the title of 'Doctor of Grace,' and virtual supremacy in Western Christendom as its expositor, he has never enjoyed like authority in the East, and therefore a statement of Greek teaching upon the topic is necessary for completeness of survey. No doubt the task is not easy, for the consensus of the Greek Fathers must be painfully collected from casual and incidental expressions in their writings, as there is no formal treatise on the subject by any one of them, and it does not even form a section in the *De Fide Orthodoxa* of St. John Damascene.

The famous Gregories are on the whole well treated; 'Gregory Nazianzen,' by Archdeacon Watkins, is perhaps the best. 'Gregory Thaumaturgus' and 'Gregory the Illuminator' are a little meagre, but materials are not very abundant; and under 'Gregory Nyssen' some fuller discussion of his eschatology is desirable than the few lines actually devoted to it, though they are accurate so far as they go. 'Gregory the Great' is a fairly good, but not specially brilliant, article, which is just what pains should have been taken to make it, since the great Pope is one of the few kingly figures which meet us in the field of ecclesiastical history, ranking as he does with Athanasius and Leo the Great, and surpassing Augustine in dignity of character and conduct. There is a slight mistake in this article, where doubt is thrown on Gregory's statement that the title of Universal Bishop was offered to the Roman Pope at the Council of Chalcedon. The fact was so, but the offer did not come from the Council, only from a priest and two deacons of Alexandria, petitioners against Dioscorus, who tried thus to curry favour with the Roman legates. The extremely difficult subject of 'Hippolytus Romanus' is carefully treated by Dr. Salmon, who leans to Dr. von Döllinger's theory that

188  
Hi  
fail  
cau  
sch  
'H  
con  
'Ic  
pos  
eno  
ima  
stak  
tian  
curs  
mai  
of ic  
phy  
this  
far  
as in  
that  
artic  
as be  
Som  
the  
the r  
what  
over  
throu  
is in  
care  
the fo  
ocum  
794, c  
in the  
groun  
denie  
portan  
name  
as wel  
presen  
withi  
bind i  
pelled  
Nicen  
it is cl



Hippolytus was the earliest Anti-pope, though he does not fail to point out the great obstacle to accepting this view caused by the absence of any ancient mention of the local schism necessarily involved, if the fact be so. The article on 'Hosius of Corduba' is very full and careful, being a useful contribution to ecclesiastical history. Professor Stokes's 'Iconoclasts' is an important article, and sets the historical position clearly before the student, but there is scarcely enough said as to the unfortunate fact that the opponents of image-worship, right as they were on the principal issue at stake, were too often heterodox on crucial questions of Christian doctrine, and showed themselves occasionally as the precursors of the rationalism of a much later day. This was one main cause of their ultimate failure and the unhappy triumph of iconolatriy. Professor Stokes does indeed specify the Monophysite tendencies of some Iconoclast leaders, but passes over this other count of the indictment against them, except in so far as he incidentally mentions Paulicians and Manichæans as included in their ranks. And yet it is the more needful that this should be set forth, because of the stress laid in the article on the Neo-Platonic factor in Alexandrian theology as being the primary cause of the tendency to image-worship. Something is said upon the point, however, in the article on the Empress Irene, by Mr. Hole, where, in summing up the results of the Second Council of Nice, he says, 'Thus what may be called the religious party of the day triumphed over the irreligion and lax belief in high places, but greatly through alliance with superstition in the lower orders.' There is in both articles a curious absence of two weighty facts: the care taken to pack and fetter the Nicene Council of 787, and the formal repudiation both of its decrees and of its claims to œcumenicity by the great Western Council of Frankfort in 794, composed of almost as many bishops as those assembled in the Eastern Synod (300 as compared with 375). The ground upon which the œcumenicity of the latter Synod was denied at Frankfort is of such high legal and historical importance that it should have been prominently mentioned, namely, that a true General Council must represent the West as well as the East, but that no Western representatives were present at Nice except the Pope's legates, while it was not within his competence to act for the whole Western Church or bind it by his action. And as the Fathers of Frankfort compelled the Pope to retract the approval he had given to the Nicene decrees, and to confirm their own contrary decisions, it is clear that they had facts to go upon, as distinguished from



mere theory. Professor Stanley Leathes has produced a useful article on 'Isidore of Seville,' a writer less studied than he fairly merits, even apart from his high place in Spanish Church history. 'James of Nisibis' is rather too thin an article, and Antonelli's fine edition of his treatises deserves more notice than the single line it receives. 'Jacobus Baradaeus,' by the same contributor, is better executed, and is a useful article; while 'Joannes of Antioch,' another of the series, is better still.

Under 'John the Faster' there is not enough said upon the dispute with Gregory the Great as to the title of Œcumenical Bishop; and though the defect is partly made good in the article on Gregory I., yet there is no cross-reference here, as there should be. 'Joannes Damascenus,' by Mr. Lupton, is a good article, and the bibliography has received due attention. The heading 'Joannes' is perhaps the best example to cite of the fulness of this dictionary as an Onomasticon, there being no fewer than 595 separate entries under it, some of which are subdivided further, one such instance numbering fifteen separate persons. The Jewish historian Josephus is placed much out of the chronological order, being nineteenth of his name in the place assigned him, though the second in date, his only predecessor in point of time being the St. Joseph of the Gospels. The article upon him, by Dr. Edersheim, is copious and helpful, but might have been compressed in diction with advantage. Another example of awkward arrangement is the place assigned to the Emperor Julian, as the hundred and third of those so named, whereas he should stand about eighth or ninth in order. The article itself, by the Bishop of Salisbury, is one of the fullest in the *Dictionary*, extending over more than forty pages, and is a sound, scholarly piece of work, honestly impartial in treatment. Another important historical article is Professor Bryce's 'Justinianus,' wisely entrusted to a lawyer, seeing that it is on his character as legislator that Justinian's rank in history, especially Church history, chiefly depends. Canon Scott Holland's 'Justin Martyr' also takes a good place amongst the articles, being a careful piece of analysis, with due attention paid to the critical problems with which Justin is rife. Chancellor Cazenove's article on the legend of the 'Theban Legion' is a very sound piece of work, embodying much reading which few would have thought of bringing to bear on such a subject. Mr. Gore's 'Leo I.' is a telling article, and very lucid, having regard to the extreme complexity of many of the transactions recorded in it, and the conflict in Leo's personal character is well brought out, between his high

and honourable bearing in most respects, and his unscrupulosity in behalf of the privileges of his See. The article on his successor, Leo II., usefully supplements an earlier one on Pope Honorius, by accumulating testimony, in addition to what is there adduced, with regard to the condemnation of Honorius for Monothelite heresy.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Ffoulkes should have added, however, when referring to the Ultramontane attempts to cover up this transaction, the falsification of the Roman Breviary in the office for June 28, the day upon which Leo II. is commemorated by a special office. Until after the middle of the sixteenth century a clause in one of the lessons for the feast, after a mention of the Sixth General Council, ran thus :

‘In qua synodo condemnati sunt Syrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, et Petrus, necnon et Macarius cum discipulo suo Stephano, sed et Polychronius novus et Simon, quia unam voluntatem et operationem in Domino Jesu Christo dixerunt vel prædicarunt, aut quia denuo prædicaturi fuerint aut defensaverint.’

In the current editions, from about 1587 downwards, the clause runs thus : ‘In eo concilio Cyrus, Sergius, et Pyrrhus condemnati sunt, unam tantummodo voluntatem et operationem in Christo prædicantes ;’ the mention of Honorius having been carefully cut out, and others omitted along with it, to make the motive less conspicuous. Mrs. Humphry Ward’s learned articles on the tangled and difficult subject of early Visigothic history in Spain show her talents much more happily employed than they have lately been, and her ‘Leovigild’ is one of her best contributions. The case of ‘Liberius,’ in some respects a graver fall from orthodoxy than that of Honorius, is dealt with impartially, and overwhelming reasons are adduced against the pleas with which Bishop Hefele in his *Conciliengeschichte* has endeavoured to do away with the evidence, notably that of St. Hilary. ‘Logos’ has proved too difficult a subject for Professor Swainson, whose article on the subject is weak and inadequate, while its palmary importance demands for it the full powers of a really able theologian. Indeed, the purely theological articles in this *Dictionary* do not on the whole compare favourably with the historical and literary discussions, though there are single articles which form exceptions to this rule, and are competently executed. We are not complaining on the ground of the tone of such articles as we disapprove, because not being

<sup>1</sup> There is a slip of the pen in this article, where it is said : ‘It is argued on this head that a general council, as well as a Pope, may err in matters *de facto*, though not in matters *de jure*.’ For the last two words read *de fide*.

Catholic enough, for while that charge is perfectly true in itself, yet it cannot be reasonably alleged against a work laying no claim to merit of the kind, and taking no measures to secure it. Our censure falls on insufficiency of survey and inadequacy of treatment from the scholar's point of view. In the article on 'Lucian of Samosata,' where the Amsterdam edition of his works in three volumes quarto, 1743, is rightly recommended as the best, it is inexactly attributed to Hemsterhuis, the actual editor being Carl Conrad Reitz, who used Hemsterhuis and Gesner as materials, and who published at Utrecht in 1746 an *Index Verborum ac Phrasium Luciani, sive Lexicon Lucianeum*, ranging with, and designed to complete, the Amsterdam edition, as the title-page expressly states. Dr. Salmon's 'Macarius Magnes' is an excellent example of minute investigation of a relatively obscure, and yet by no means unimportant, subject, just one of those where a dictionary of this kind is specially useful to scholars. Professor Stokes's 'Manichæans' is a useful compendium, but rather too much abbreviated in parts, notably when explaining the doctrinal system of those heretics, for the disastrous survival of their opinions, even to the present day, in unsuspected quarters has done so much mischief to religion that it is desirable to have a specialised account of them as a danger-signal. Mr. Ffoulkes's 'Marcellus of Ancyra' is a helpful guide through a tangled episode of Church history; and Dr. Salmon's 'Marcion' and 'Marcus the Gnostic' are equally valuable. There is, we take it, a slight misconception in Professor Stokes's remark under 'Marina (3),' that the name is 'erroneously written Margaret' in some MSS. of Usuard's *Martyrology*. The fact is that Marina is the saint known as Margaret in the West, and that this latter name is not in the Eastern menologies, unless as an epithet of one of the Pelagias. And there is no 'Margaret' in the *Dictionary* itself. There should have been two such entries, the legendary martyr of Antioch, and the historical one of Carthage in 304. Dr. Cazenove's 'Martin of Tours' has a sensible discussion of the miraculous element in this and kindred biographies, which makes some amends for the absence of such an article on 'Miracles' as would have fitly been included in the present work, but which is lacking. 'Mithras' is somewhat thin, and there is not enough said upon the sacrificial Mithraic group, and its possible connexion with the *taurobolium* of the rites of Cybele. On the other hand, Dr. Badger's 'Muhammad' goes into considerable detail, and is a convenient summary of a very large subject, but some retouchings would improve it. 'Nero' is a respect-

able  
again  
to be  
given  
'Nes  
trina  
need  
for a  
conf  
easil  
full-l  
the s  
geth  
Cass  
Seve  
serv  
diou  
artic  
Ches  
of h  
for t  
trust  
very  
stag  
Fath  
othe  
be m  
cont  
serie  
mon  
vers  
teen  
Wes  
piec  
his b  
Mr.  
this  
agai  
Gen  
attri  
in re  
is th  
H. M  
F. N  
circu

able article, but not of special mark, and the arguments against accepting the theory that the number of the beast is to be sought in the words Νέκρων Καΐσαρ ought to have been given as well as the theory itself. In Professor Stokes's 'Nestorianism' the historical portion is better than the doctrinal, which is practically an excerpt from Neander, and needs some amplification. As it stands, it is quite possible for a student to fail in ascertaining how Nestorianism is in conflict with the Catholic tenet of the Incarnation, or how easily it might glide into Semi-Arianism first, and thence into full-blown Photinianism. We have to complain yet again of the same learned contributor's 'Monasteries of Nitria,' as altogether too thin and perfunctory. It is not enough to be sent to Cassian, to the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, and to Sulpicius Severus for details as to the mode of life and discipline observed by the ascetics of Nitria; what is wanted is a compendious summary of the information therein, the function of an article in such a dictionary as the present. The Bishop of Chester's 'Offa' is a good example of his thorough treatment of historical matters. It has been unfortunate for him and for the *Dictionary* that for the most part the biographies entrusted to him have necessarily been those of personages of very minor importance, playing their part on a very narrow stage, and thus not vying in sphere and interest with the great Fathers, Popes, and Emperors who have fallen to the lot of other contributors to record. Almost the same remark may be made in respect of Canon Raine's numerous and helpful contributions. 'Ophites' is yet another of the remarkable series of articles on early forms of Gnosticism which Dr. Salmon has written for the *Dictionary*, and those who are not versed in the subject will note with some surprise that seventeen columns are required for this single entry. Professor Westcott's 'Origenes' is a very painstaking and scholarly piece of work, failing, perhaps, to appreciate Origen fully on his better side, but honestly aiming at an impartial estimate. Mr. Dale's 'Origenistic Controversies' is a useful appendix to this article, and very carefully weighs the arguments for and against the belief that Origen was condemned by the Fifth General Council. There is, however, a serious error in the attribution of a recent book touching on the subject, written in reply to Dr. Pusey, published in 1881-2, and named *What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment?* to the late Rev. H. N. Oxenham. The book is, in fact, by his cousin, Mr. F. N. Oxenham, and the seriousness of the mistake lies in the circumstance that Mr. H. N. Oxenham has also contributed

to the controversy a volume entitled *Catholic Eschatology*, published in 1876, and taking a line on the whole according with that of Dr. Pusey. Dr. Gwynn's 'Pantænus' puts into brief compass, and clearly, all that is recoverable regarding one who is only a shadowy personality now, great as is the part he seems to have played in his own day. 'Papias' is an excellent article of Dr. Salmon's, and demolishes M. Renan's fine-spun theory as to the genesis of the Synoptic Gospels derived from this quarter. To the *apparatus criticus* appended to Professor Stokes's article 'Patricius' has now to be added Dr. Whitley Stokes's edition of the *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, published in the Rolls Series, 1887-8. Another book which might have been cited as a literary curiosity is the *Patritiana Decas* of Philip O'Sullivan, published at Madrid in 1629, and inspired with a lively polemical hatred of the English and their Church, visible on the very title-page, which speaks 'de Anglohæresis sectis, cacopræsulibus,' and the like. The late Mr. Scudamore's 'Patron Saints and Angels' contains the most lucid account of the rise and growth of the tenet and practice of Invocation of the Saints that we have met with, but it does not bring out with sufficient clearness the precise limits of the practice as current in the fourth and fifth centuries, so that the reader can learn whether it goes beyond the form technically known as 'Comprecation,' which differs both in kind and degree from the usage current now in the Latin Church.

The article on the 'Paulicians' should have included some more direct reference, either in the text or in a foot-note, to the derivation of the Albigenses from these sectaries. A quick-witted reader may, indeed, guess so much from Albi being named as one of the places where descendants of the Paulicians were found in the Middle Ages; but an important point of the kind should not be left to be guessed at, especially when the popular notion as to the Albigenses is that they were closely akin to the seventeenth-century Puritans. This view appears in a clever, but now forgotten, historical novel, *The Albigenses*, by Charles Robert Maturin, published in 1824, wherein, but for the environment, the sectaries might pass for own brothers to Scott's Covenanters in *Old Mortality*. 'Paulus of Samosata,' by Prebendary Venables, is well done and useful, and the obscurer personality of 'Paulus Tellensis' has been most carefully elucidated by Dr. Gwynn. The paragraphs on Semi-Pelagianism in Professor Ince's otherwise useful article on 'Pelagius' need expansion, and the reader should be put more clearly in possession of the fact that Semi-Pelagianism

is in fact an invidious epithet, coined under hyper-Augustinian influence, for that which was the received doctrine of Christendom in general till Augustinianism arose, and is still the current teaching of the Eastern Church, which ranks Cassian, one of its chief exponents, amongst the Saints, a title denied him in the West for this very reason. Dr. Edersheim has worked to good purpose in his 'Philo,' which, if not an exhaustive article, will yet give all but the most exacting student all that is reasonably to be looked for in a dictionary. Professor Lipsius has carefully treated the difficult topic of the 'Pistis Sophia,' and at considerable length. Mr. Ffoulkes's 'Predestination' is one of those theological articles which help to redress the balance of the *Dictionary* in this its weakest department, and he helpfully controverts the hyper-Augustinianism of the late Dr. Mozley. The article on 'Prosper of Aquitaine,' who came nearer to absolute Calvinism than Augustine ever did, should be read in connexion with this one. Mr. Lock's 'Prudentius' seems to us to underrate his poetical merits. No doubt he is not in the first flight of Christian poetry, but he is occasionally more than happy, and deserved rather more recognition than is granted him here. There is a useful article, the result of collaboration by Mr. Scudamore and Professor Stokes, on 'Pseudepigrapha in the Fathers.' If it be practicable, a similar article on interpolations in the Fathers themselves would be a most valuable addition in any future issue of the *Dictionary*. Dr. Salmon's essay on the 'Opus Imperfectum in Matthæum,' entitled 'Pseudo-Chrysostomus,' subserves this end for one eminent Father. Chancellor Cazenove's 'Quicumque vult' is a model of temperate statement, and presents the case for the fifth-century date of the Creed in a very forcible manner. He does not refer to the suggestion of Hilary of Poitiers as its possible author, a view which has a certain plausibility, and at least merited a passing mention. 'Salvianus,' by Professor Stokes, is another of the somewhat thin articles, where the reader does not get all he is fairly entitled to learn. Yet as this defect is more noticeable in articles towards the close of the *Dictionary*, it may be no fault of the writer, but an incident due to questions of space and cost, falling within the province of the publishers to decide. Mr. Mozley's 'Seneca' is commendable, but its value to the general student would have been enhanced by more citations, exhibiting the quasi-Christian tone of thought and even of verbal expression recurrent in this writer. Something of the kind is done, so that it is not as matter of oversight that what we desiderate is absent, but we



do not think the most telling illustrations have been chosen. We could cite such passages by the dozen, and will give a few specimens of what we mean: 'Deus colitur et amatur;' 'Ipsis Deus consulit, quos esse quam honestissimos cupit, quoties illis materiam præbet aliquid animose fortiterque faciendi;' 'Subsilire in cælum, ex angulo licet;' 'Mortale est omne mortalium bonum; verum autem bonum non moritur, certum est, sempiternumque; hoc unum contingit immortale mortalibus;' 'Hæc unica salus homini, cognitio Dei.'

'Severus of Antioch' is a convenient summary, but has traces of the over-compression attributable to the exigencies of space. In the bibliography of 'Sibylline Oracles' Dr. Neale's important review of Alexandre's edition, reprinted in his *Essays in Liturgiology and Church History*, is unfortunately omitted. The article 'Silvester' goes carefully into the legends and figments which have clustered about this particular Pope's name in greater number than common, but which belong to a recurrent class of inventions for the same polemical object of pushing the claims of the Roman See, so that they can be seen here conveniently together, as typical examples of the methods employed. Dr. Salmon is well to the front again in his article on 'Simon Magus,' which is a useful supplement to that in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, and displays a most robust incredulity of Baur's hypothesis that St. Paul is the person designated as Simon in the Acts and in the Clementine Recognitions. Dr. Milligan's 'Socrates' is little more than a panegyric of that historian, merited, indeed, but not of much practical value to the student, who would be more aided by an analysis of his *Ecclesiastical History*. Mr. Barmby's series of articles on the Popes named Stephen are sound, unpretending pieces of work, helpful to the student. 'Synesius,' by the late Rev. T. R. Halcombe, is an exception to the tendency towards abridgment at this stage of the *Dictionary*, for it occupies twenty-four pages, and is a very full monograph on an interesting personality. 'Tatian the Apologist' fares nearly as well, being conceded twenty pages, entrusted to Professor Fuller. The now famous 'Didaché, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' has fallen to Dr. Salmon, and fortunately, as he has given us a very clear and helpful article. Funk's edition, published at Tübingen in 1887, and including the Apostolic Canons and the 'Exposition of the Two Ways,' going under the name of St. Barnabas, should now be added to the bibliography. 'Tertullian' is another subject receiving its rightful share of space, Professor Fuller having been allowed forty-six pages and a half for its treatment, and making the most of them. Dr. Gwynn's 'Thecla'

is  
bear  
criti  
grap  
does  
desp  
thou  
is in  
and  
trifi  
the  
but  
a co  
that  
theo  
and  
'The  
dead  
Trin  
cont  
copi  
form  
othe  
are  
Bar  
and  
wou  
the  
ab o  
as b  
fulfi  
just  
are  
from  
or m  
men  
acce  
cede  
be m  
by t  
  
sion  
mon  
type  
of s

is also a copious discussion, by reason of the important bearing of the legendary Acts on early Gnosticism and on the critical questions affecting the canonical Acts. The bibliography of Prebendary Venables's useful article on 'Theodoret' does not make quite clear enough that the edition by Schulze, despite its clumsy shape and detestable paper, is the best, though so much is indirectly implied. The Bishop of Chester is in his element with such a subject as 'Theodore of Tarsus,' and gives a thoroughly sound article upon it. There is a trifling misprint in the bibliography—the imperfect edition of the *Penitential*, by Jacques Petit, was not published in 1677, but in 1679. Professor Swete's 'Theodore of Mopsuestia' is a commendable article, giving full credit to the real merits of that remarkable man, while not attempting to whitewash his theological reputation. Canon Bright's 'Theophilus of Alexandria' merits special mention, and so does Dr. Gwynn's 'Thomas Harklensis,' a very scholarly piece of criticism. Archdeacon Cheetham's historical essay on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is very carefully done, and exhibits the phases of the controversy in lucid chronological order. 'Valentinus' is a copious article by Professor Lipsius, dealing fully with the form of Gnosticism of which Valentinus was founder; and other noticeable contributions at the very end of the work are 'Victorinus Afer,' by Mr. Gore; Pope 'Vigilius,' by Mr. Barmby; 'Vincentius Lirinensis,' by Chancellor Cazenove; and 'Wilfrid,' by Canon Raine, all deserving attention. It would have been worth while remarking, in the discussion of the famous Vincentian rule, 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est,' that the objection raised against it as being a mere juggle, since its conditions have never been fulfilled, breaks down before the historical and legal fact that just these three conditions, applied in another sphere, are what are required to attest English common law, as distinguished from statute law and equity, or judge-made law; and trifling or merely technical exceptions to the three conditions of immemorial usage, prevalence throughout England, and general acceptance, do not affect its validity. There is thus no antecedent impossibility in applying a rule of the sort, and it may be not unfairly observed that it is most likely to be challenged by those to whom its application would prove inconvenient.

It has been impracticable to review a work of the dimensions of this *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, containing more than four thousand pages of double columns in small type, with any pretence at exhaustiveness or even minuteness of survey. It is as much as is attainable to give a general

notion of its character, contents, and quality; and though we have not hesitated to point out its defects wherever they have struck us, yet its merits are far in excess of these minor shortcomings, and must win for it praise, welcome, and influence wherever scholars are found interested in the groups of topics with which it deals.

#### ART. IV.—THE RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF S. T. COLERIDGE.

1. *Memorials of Coleorton: being Letters from Coleridge, Wordsworth and his Sister, Southey and Sir Walter Scott, to Sir George and Lady Beaumont of Coleorton, Leicestershire, 1803-1834.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by WILLIAM KNIGHT, University of St. Andrews. 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1887.)
2. *Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Romantic School.* By ALOIS BRANDL, Professor of English Language and Literature, German University of Prague. English Edition by LADY EASTLAKE. (London, 1887.)

THE marvellous progress which the Church has made during the last fifty years has perhaps caused us to do scant justice to the merits which she possessed during the dark days of the nineteenth century which preceded the great revival. That period was one of the most brilliant periods of English literature. Why men of great literary genius come in batches—whether it is that human minds are like certain trees, which will not thrive if they are planted alone, but which help to draw one another up if they are planted together—is a question which we need not here discuss. The point we would notice is that among the great writers at the beginning of this century almost all who can be fairly credited with moral earnestness, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, were drawn, with an ever-deepening attachment as they advanced in life, to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England. We say 'in the ordinary acceptation of the term' because an attempt seems now to be made to credit with moral earnestness that school of writers which Southey called, point-blank, without circumlocution, the 'Satanic School.'

But, surely, the laws of morality are eternal and immutable ; and if the dazzling brilliancy of genius may blind us to their force, it cannot suspend them. There was, however, a very different class of writers from that of the 'Satanic School ;' and in one—indeed, in more than one—of this class the publications at the head of this article have recently awakened a fresh interest. In this galaxy of talent Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge were stars of the first magnitude ; but there were also many minor lights. Of the great triumvirate by far the most imperfect, but at the same time the most interesting and lovable character was Samuel Taylor Coleridge. We *respect* Wordsworth, with his blameless purity of life, his noble independence, his heroic and, as the event has proved, well-grounded confidence in the verdict of posterity, in spite of the ridicule of contemporaries ; we *admire* Southey, with his equally blameless life, his indomitable perseverance, his general high-mindedness ; but we *love* Coleridge, in spite of his many shortcomings. He appeals to our sympathy and wins it, and sympathy is very near akin to love. He was a many-sided man, and it is the object of this paper to disentangle, as far as possible, Coleridge the religious thinker from Coleridge the poet, Coleridge the philosopher, Coleridge the politician, Coleridge the scholar, and Coleridge the conversationalist. Of course, this can only be done to a very limited extent ; for the various elements of this extraordinary man's character and career so run into and illustrate one another that it is very difficult to pick out one, to the ignoring of the rest, and most difficult of all to separate the element of theology which ran, as a thread, through all his life and writings. Again, it is impossible to trace the development of Coleridge's religious opinions without touching upon the circumstances of his life ; for his theology was, in a more than ordinary degree, affected by those circumstances.

To begin, then, at the beginning. Coleridge was born in 1772, in a country parsonage, his father belonging to a class which was not so rare in the eighteenth century as is commonly supposed—the class of worthy country parsons. John Coleridge, vicar of Ottery St. Mary and head-master of the King's School there, was a gentleman and a scholar, a man of childlike simplicity, rather eccentric, and very absent-minded. All these qualities he transmitted to his youngest son, who cherished his memory with fond reverence. 'Oh! that I might so pass away,' said Coleridge thirty years after his father's death, 'if, like him, I was an Israelite without guile! The image of my father, my revered, kind,

learned, simple-hearted father, is a religion to me.'<sup>1</sup> Without entering into details, it is quite obvious that there was nothing in Coleridge's home surroundings to draw him away from orthodox churchmanship. The same might be thought of his school and college training at Christ's Hospital and Jesus College, Cambridge: for the former was a markedly religious establishment, the outward observances of religion being most strictly attended to, and a full third of the seven hundred scholars being the sons of clergymen; while the latter was a distinctly clerical college, having long held a reputation for the study of divinity, and being under the direct protection of the Bishop of Ely. It was, however, at school and at college that the seeds of scepticism in Coleridge were not only sown but actually grew to maturity. Christ's Hospital was an exaggerated type of the public school of that date, with its scant and coarse food, its Spartan discipline, and its flogging system, which Mr. Boyer—or Bowyer, as Coleridge always spelt the name—carried out most conscientiously and *con amore*. The theology of the place in general, and of Mr. Boyer in particular, was of the old-fashioned, prosaic, utilitarian type—Paley being the chief authority. Chapel services were frequent, and it is not uncharitable to suppose that they were of the dull, unattractive kind usual at that period. Altogether, it was not exactly the place to suit a boy of highly-delicate and sensitive organism, dreamy, thoughtful, and imaginative beyond his years. His amazing precocity is shown by the fact that while his comrades were busy with their rough games he spent his leisure in puzzling his brain over Neo-Platonic metaphysics. Indeed, from his own account, he must have been an *enfant terrible*. 'Before my fifteenth year,' he says, 'I had bewildered myself in metaphysics and in theological controversy. Nothing else pleased me. Highly was I delighted if anyone, especially in black, would enter into conversation with me; for I soon found the means of directing it to my favourite studies.'<sup>2</sup> He was led on from Platonism—or rather Plotinism—into Pantheism, and then he began to study Voltaire's *Philosophical Dictionary*, and the result of it all was that the poor lad proclaimed himself an unbeliever. Mr. Boyer made short work of his scepticism. 'So, sirrah,' he said, 'you are an infidel, are you? Then I'll flog your infidelity out of you;' and he flogged him severely. This *argumentum ad baculum* was not effectual; but it is very characteristic of Coleridge's humble and amiable nature that,

<sup>1</sup> Biographical Supplement to *Biographia Literaria*, p. 325.

<sup>2</sup> *Biographia Literaria*, p. 14.

so far from resenting it, he often said in after days that it was the only just flogging he ever received; and, cruelly as he must have suffered both in body and mind all through his school career, he distinctly states: 'At school I enjoyed the inestimable advantage of a very sensible, though at the same time a very severe, master, the Rev. James Bowyer.'<sup>1</sup> We must not pass on from his schooldays without noticing two names which had great weight with him in those early times.

'Bowles' Sonnets,' he says, 'were first made known to me by a schoolfellow who had been my patron and protector, Dr. Middleton, the truly learned and every way excellent Bishop of Calcutta. It was a double pleasure to me, and still remains a tender recollection, that I should have received from a friend so revered the first knowledge of a poet by whose works, year after year, I was so enthusiastically delighted and inspired.'<sup>2</sup>

If we were writing of Coleridge as a poet it would be necessary to discuss his extraordinary infatuation about the poetry of Bowles; but so far as religion went, that poetry would do him nothing but good.

In 1791 Coleridge went to Jesus College, carrying with him, thanks in a great measure to Mr. Boyer, a large amount of scholarship, but carrying also his unsettled views, which were not settled at that seat of sound learning and religious education, but quite the reverse. There was then a certain Mr. Frend, a Fellow of the College, who exercised great influence both over Coleridge's philosophical and also his religious opinions. He introduced him to the writings of David Hartley (who, by the way, had himself been a Fellow of Jesus College), and Coleridge was so much fascinated with his new guide that he called his eldest son Hartley after him. He was also much attracted by the writings of Godwin and Priestley. Important as these factors—Hartley, Godwin, and Priestley—were in the formation of Coleridge's opinions at this time, it must suffice here to say that they all tended to alienate him from the faith of the Church. Other and more general causes tended to the same result. The French Revolution was at its height, and, like many other enthusiastic young men, he saw in this vast upheaval in France the dawn of a glorious era of liberty, when all abuses should be redressed, when all men should 'know the truth, and the truth should make them free.' The cruelties of the Reign of Terror produced a violent reaction in the minds of many of the sympathizers with the earlier movement, but Coleridge still clung to

<sup>1</sup> *Biographia Literaria*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13.



his hopeful aspirations. He became an ardent Republican, and in those days Republicanism in politics went hand-in-hand with scepticism in religion. The authorities of Jesus College were most forbearing with him. He ran away and enlisted in a Dragoon regiment, but was received back with a simple reprimand. When Mr. Frend's publications rendered it necessary for him to be deprived of his fellowship, Coleridge showed the strongest and most demonstrative sympathy with him, and this also was overlooked. And, finally, when he concocted with R. Southey, whose acquaintance he had made in one of the college vacations, and other ardent youths, his wild scheme of a 'Pantisocracy' on the banks of the Susquehanna, the Master reasoned with him most kindly, and insisted upon giving him a longer time for reconsideration than the statutes allow before removing his name from the College boards. Well might Coleridge speak in after days with regret and gratitude (but he was never wanting in grateful recognition of those who had done him service) of 'the friendly cloisters and the happy grove of quiet, ever-honoured Jesus College, Cambridge,' which he left without a degree. It was in his University days that he published his *Religious Musings*, which reflect the sentiments of the Neo-Platonists, just made known to the English public by William Taylor's translations from Plotinus. In this work Coleridge pays a tribute to his new directors, speaking of Hartley as 'He, of mortal tribe the wisest,' and of Priestley as 'a patriot, saint, and sage, who sowed religion in the same furrow with Reason and Science.' There was one other writer who fascinated Coleridge greatly at this time, and who, one would have thought, must have influenced him in the orthodox direction, viz. the pious Bishop Berkeley, of whom he afterwards showed his admiration in the same odd way in which he showed it in the case of Hartley, by calling his second son Berkeley. But the general result was that he was now an avowed Unitarian—after a very peculiar kind. His position can only be described in his own words: 'I was,' he says, 'at that time [the time when he was setting up *The Watchman*, just after he left Cambridge], though a Trinitarian (i.e. *ad normam Platonis*) in philosophy, yet a zealous Unitarian in religion.'<sup>1</sup> The explanation of this seems to be that he accepted the Platonic triad, but not the Christian Trinity; or, as Professor Brandl well puts it:—

'He was driven to interpret symbolically many a point in his creed which the Church holds literally. . . . The Second Person of the

<sup>1</sup> Gillman's *Life*, i. 76.

Trin  
crea  
sion

frien

the S  
of t  
critic  
neigh  
out  
enou  
had  
aton  
balan  
or th  
the g

are  
he w  
bein  
broth  
devo  
prea  
own  
Bath  
ties  
that  
(the  
the  
coat  
than  
with  
Law  
on t  
whic  
cont  
his  
to u

exp

<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>2</sup>

1795  
ment  
Syste  
V

Trinity was no longer God except as in a pantheistic sense, every human creature is divine; but sunk into the sublimest bearer of a divine mission. Thus Neoplatonism led to the Unitarian confession' (p. 54).

In point of fact he must have been rather an embarrassing friend to the Unitarians.

'I can truly say,' he declared in after life, 'that I never falsified the Scripture. I always told the Unitarians that their interpretations of the Scripture were intolerable upon any principles of sound criticism; and that if they were to offer to construe the will of a neighbour as they did that of their Maker, they would be scouted out of society. I said then plainly and openly, that it was clear enough that John and Paul were not Unitarians. But at that time I had a strong sense of the repugnancy of the doctrine of vicarious atonement to the moral being, and I thought nothing could counter-balance that. "What care I," I said, "for the Platonisms of John, or the Rabbinisms of Paul? My conscience revolts!" That was the ground of my Unitarianism.'

How the Unitarians relished such very plain speaking we are not informed, but they seem to have taken him for what he was; for he all but became a regular Unitarian minister, being only saved from it by the extreme kindness of the two brothers Wedgwood, who allowed him 150*l.* that he might devote all his time to literature. As it was, he frequently preached in Unitarian chapels, but after a fashion quite his own. The account of his first appearance in the pulpit at Bath is sufficiently ludicrous. To the dismay of the authorities he refused to don the regulation black gown, declaring that he would not 'touch a rag of the Babylonish woman' (the Church of his baptism!), and accordingly he appeared in the pulpit in a blue coat with brass buttons and a white waistcoat. Nor was the matter of his sermons less incongruous than his dress. In the morning he regaled his congregation with a *réchauffé* of a lecture he had been giving on the Corn Laws, and in the afternoon with a *réchauffé* of another lecture on the Hair Powder Tax. Indeed it is from the lectures which he delivered, and the periodicals which he edited or contributed to, more than from his poems or his sermons, that his anti-Church sentiments at this early period are known to us.<sup>2</sup>

That he was not happy in his creed we have his own express testimony:—

<sup>1</sup> *Table Talk*, June 23, 1834, p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., his *Address to the People: On the Present War*, 1795; *Essay on Fasts*, 1796; [Ironical] *Defence of the Church Establishment from its Similitude to the Grand and Simple Laws of the Planetary System*, 1796.

'I found myself,' he says, 'all afloat; doubts rushed in; broke upon me from the fountains of the great deep, and fell from the windows of heaven. The fontal truths of Natural Religion, and the books of Revelation, alike contributed to the flood; and it was long ere my ark touched an Ararat and rested. . . . My head was with Spinoza, though my whole heart remained with Paul and John.'<sup>1</sup>

Events were occurring which tended to sever his connexion (such as it was) with the Unitarians. In the first place his day-dreams of the blessings which were to follow the French Revolution were all rudely shattered. They had survived the shock which had staggered many others—the execution of the king and queen—but they could not survive the attack upon the liberties of Switzerland. Then he saw what he calls 'the horrid delusion, the vile mockery of the whole affair,' and he did penance for his error by the following outburst in the 'Ode on France,' which will be found in his *Sibylline Leaves*:

'Forgive me, Freedom! O forgive those dreams!  
I hear thy voice, I hear thy loud lament,  
From bleak Helvetia's icy cavern sent—  
I hear thy groans upon her blood-stain'd streams!  
Heroes, that for your peaceful country perish'd,  
And ye that, fleeing, spot your mountain-snows  
With bleeding wounds; forgive me that I cherish'd  
One thought that ever bless'd your cruel foes!'<sup>2</sup>

Jacobinism and infidelity were very closely connected; the explosion of the one could hardly fail to shake the other. How far his acquaintance with Wordsworth, which he made about this time, affected his religious views is not very clear, but we can hardly doubt that one for whom he at once conceived and retained so enthusiastic an admiration must have influenced his faith, at least indirectly. 'Wordsworth,' he writes in 1797, 'and his exquisite sister are with me.' 'He is one whom, God knows, I love and honour as far beyond myself, as both morally and intellectually he is above me.' And in 1798: 'The Giant Wordsworth—God love him! When I speak in the terms of admiration due to his intellect, I fear lest those terms should keep out of sight the amiableness of his manners.' But was not Wordsworth himself tarred with the same brush as Coleridge? No doubt he, too, had been at first fascinated by the promises of the Revolution, but he had been very soon disillusionized; and while the illusions lasted they never carried him to the length they carried Coleridge. Circumstances have led the present writer to look very closely into the life of Wordsworth, and to read

<sup>1</sup> Gillman's *Life*, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> *Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, i. 130 (Aldine edition, 1834).

a vast number of private letters written by him and 'his exquisite sister' Dorothy which have never been published; and the result has been a much higher estimate of the pious, unselfish, truly Christian and orthodox characters of both than he had before, and a strong conviction that any intimacy with two such people must have had a distinctly Christianizing tendency.<sup>1</sup> Coleridge's friendship with Southey might seem calculated to confirm him in his Unitarianism, for Southey's views were at that time Unitarian; but Southey, too, had an indirect share in the change. In this way. The wild scheme, which Coleridge and Southey and one or two other enthusiastic young men formed, of establishing an ideal colony on the banks of Susquehanna, led to one practical result, viz. the marriage of Coleridge with Sarah—or Sara, as he preferred to call her—Fricker, Southey himself marrying the younger sister, Edith. The marriages sprang directly out of the Pantisocratic scheme, a part of which—and the only part which was ever carried out—was that the young Pantisocrats were all to be married. The relations between Mr. and Mrs. Coleridge were not always of the happiest kind, but in these early days she had influence over him, and that influence would be exercised in an orthodox direction, for she was a quiet, humble Christian.

But, after all, the chief impulse which led Coleridge to return to the faith of his fathers came from within rather than from without, and it was partly an intellectual and partly a moral impulse. He himself tells us that he is 'one who feels the want, the necessity of religious support; who cannot afford to lose any, the smallest, buttress; who not only loves the Truth even for itself, and when it reveals itself aloof from all interest, but who loves it with an indescribable awe,' which causes him 'to creep towards the light, even though it draw him from the more nourishing warmth.' But his views changed as to how Truth was to be attained. 'I became convinced that religion, as both the corner-stone and the key-stone of morality, must have a *moral* origin; that the evidence of its doctrines could not, like the truths of abstract science, be wholly independent of the will.'<sup>2</sup> Here his Platonism came in to his aid. It is a curious fact that the same system which, as we have seen, had been a sort of half-way house in his downward course, stood him in the same stead on his return journey. From Platonism to Pantheism, and from Pantheism to denial

<sup>1</sup> The same impression is left by the delightful letters in the *Memoirs of Coleorton*.

<sup>2</sup> Gillman, p. 91.

of the real divinity of Christ, this was his progress on the way to Unitarianism. But Unitarianism did not satisfy his moral needs, and, on the other hand, the doctrine of the Atonement did not satisfy his intellectual faculties: how was the chasm to be bridged over? Here Platonism, or rather its twin sister, Christian mysticism, stepped in and told him in effect that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned; and he caught at the idea as a drowning man catches at a straw, and it brought him safe to land. 'Evidences of Christianity!' he exclaimed; 'I am weary of the word. Make a man feel the want of it, and you may safely trust it to its own evidence.' This has been criticized as a 'scarcely intelligible utterance,' considering that Christianity is an historical religion based on historical facts.<sup>1</sup> But in justice to Coleridge it should be borne in mind that he did not deny the historical facts, but merely reversed the usual order of proof; that is, instead of making the truth of Christianity depend upon the truth of the miracles and the prophecies, he believed the miracles and prophecies *because* he had been convinced of the truth of Christianity, and he was convinced of the truth of Christianity because he felt within him a need which nothing but Christianity could supply. His own soul told him that the theory of optimism was erroneous: this was *not* the best of all possible worlds; there was evil in it, there was evil in himself; he had need of an atonement, he had need of a Saviour, and that Saviour must be really divine, or He would be quite insufficient, and the atonement He made would be no atonement. Thus he was led a stage beyond Platonism; but we have his own words to show that Platonism *was* a stage in his upward journey. 'I cannot doubt,' he says, 'that the difference of my metaphysical notions from those of Unitarians in general contributed to my final reconversion to the whole truth in Christ, even as, according to his own confession, the books of certain Platonic philosophers commenced the rescue of St. Augustine's faith from the same error.' In 1805 he speaks of his 'mind wavering seven or eight years ago in its necessary passage from Unitarianism (which, as I have often said, is the religion of a man whose reason would make him an atheist, but whose heart and common sense will not permit him to be so) through Spinozism into Plato and St. John.' The fact is, Coleridge's was one of those inquiring minds which will not be satisfied without 'boulting a matter to the bran.' Having reached Unitarianism he felt that he was on a sliding scale, and could not rest there.

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Fitzgerald's essay on the 'Evidences of Christianity,' in *Aids to Faith*.

'I owe,' he says, 'under God my return to the faith, to my having gone much farther than the Unitarians, and so having come round to the other side.' What he means by this is clear from a remarkably thoughtful and powerful letter which he wrote to his old friend and publisher, Joseph Cottle, in 1807, in which he shows that objections to the doctrine of the Trinity are really objections to a revelation generally. 'The Trinity has its difficulties. It would be strange if otherwise. A Revelation that revealed nothing, not within the grasp of human reason!' The objections to the doctrine of the divinity of the Saviour were really objections to the doctrine that he was a great moral teacher. For 'if Jesus Christ was merely a man he could not have been even a good man. There is no medium. The Saviour in *that case* was absolutely a *deceiver*, one transcendently *unrighteous* in advancing pretensions to miracles "by the finger of God" which he never performed.'<sup>1</sup> Hence he felt that if he went on logically he would be drifting on into a state where there was no belief in a revelation, no belief in Christ as a teacher at all. But his whole moral nature revolted against this.

'I was,' he says, 'for many years a Socinian, and at times almost a naturalist; but sorrow and ill health, and disappointment in the only deep wish I had ever cherished, forced me to look into myself; I read the New Testament again, and I became fully convinced that Socinianism was not only not the doctrine of the New Testament, but that it scarcely deserved the name of a religion in any sense.'<sup>2</sup>

And then follows a sentence which shows us (as indeed the whole history of his early life shows us) *how* Coleridge had drifted away from Christianity. 'I fear the mode of defending Christianity adopted by Grotius first, and latterly, among many others, by Dr. Paley, has increased the number of infidels.' It was the hard, dry, rationalizing, utilitarian spirit in which Christianity had been treated in the eighteenth century from which Coleridge's tender and imaginative spirit had recoiled, and it was through the poetical and idealizing system of the Platonists that he found his way back again.

We have seen that it was a moral rather than an intellectual impulse which drew Coleridge away from the Unitarians; but there was an intellectual element in it as well. 'He has often said,' writes his first biographer, 'that one of the effects of his preaching was that it compelled him to examine the Scriptures with greater care and industry. These additional exertions and studies assisted mainly to his final conversion

<sup>1</sup> Cottle's *Reminiscences*, p. 316.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 338.



to the whole truth.' 'He learnt,' says his daughter, 'to think better of our great Anglican divines as a body, in part from the expansion and consolidation of his views with regard to the Church, and partly from increased acquaintance with those works, and high admiration of them in their literary and theological capacity.' In plain words, his dislike of the obvious doctrines of Scripture and of the great divines of the Church of England was simply the result of ignorance. When he knew more of both his tone changed.

A visit to Germany supplied the last stage in his reconversion :—

'While my mind was thus perplexed, by a gracious providence, for which I can never be sufficiently thankful, the generous and munificent patronage of Mr. Josiah and Mr. Thomas Wedgwood enabled me to finish my education in Germany. Instead of troubling others with my own crude notions and juvenile compositions, I was thenceforward better employed in attempting to store my own head with the wisdom of others. I made the best use of my time and means ; and there is therefore no period of my life on which I can look back with such unmingled satisfaction.'<sup>1</sup>

This was in 1798, and he remained in Germany for nearly a year. On his return he studied deeply the German writers. The process by which his study of German philosophy helped to reconvert him to Christian orthodoxy was this : Kant, of all men in the world, became in a sense a spiritual father to him, and reason, of all words in the world, became his watchword ! Now, 'reason' was the very basis of eighteenth century theology ; the theology against which Coleridge protested with all his heart and soul. Locke had struck the key-note in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, and to reconcile Christianity to reason was the one great effort of the Evidential school, against which Coleridge waged an almost life-long war. But reason meant something very different in Coleridge's view from what it meant in 'the watchmaker's scheme of prudence.' It was rather what the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century, whom Coleridge always admired, meant when they spoke of 'the breath of a higher, diviner reason,' 'the first participation from God,' 'the sacerdotal breastplate of the λόγος or rationale,' 'the candle of the Lord,' 'a beam of divine light.'<sup>2</sup> Professor Brandl brings this well out in his description of Coleridge's second unfortunate attempt at conducting a periodical. Nothing illustrates better

<sup>1</sup> Gillman, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> See Henry More's, John Smith's, and other Platonists' works, *passim*.

the difference between the earlier and the later Coleridge than a comparison between the ill-starred *Watchman* and the equally ill-starred *Friend*. The object of the latter was 'to aid in the formation of fixed principles in politics, morals, and religion,' and the professor sketches admirably its historical significance :—

'It was one of the first protests against the merely useful, the merely moral, which had been the fashion till now. It recommends not only prudence, but wisdom ; not only verbal truth, but veracity ; not only legality, but rectitude. It is a laudation of the long-neglected forces of the soul ; of "the mysterious mother of conscience ;" of the Kantian principle of reason in its most romantic interpretation, "the best and holiest gift of Heaven, the bond of union with the Giver"' (p. 303).

Soon after Coleridge's return to England, he took up his residence at Greta Hall, near Keswick (1800), within a walk of Wordsworth's home. The neighbourhood of Wordsworth could hardly fail to be beneficial to his religious character ; and his keen appreciation of the beauty of God's world in that lonely part led him upward to the God who made it. 'I look now,' he writes to Godwin, 'on the mountains—that visible God Almighty that looks in at all my windows.' But, having now distinctly accepted Christianity as a divine revelation, having distinctly formulated his belief, 'No Christ, no God—no Trinity, no God,' his thoughtful mind proceeded to investigate other points, as corollaries to this belief. He brings out very forcibly a doctrine which had been almost lost sight of since the days of his favourite divines of the seventeenth century, the doctrine of a visible Church. The High Churchmen of those days were vigorous defenders of the established, national Church, but few of them distinguished with sufficient clearness between the mere establishment of the Church and the Church itself. Coleridge thoroughly went with them as far as they went, but he also went much further :—

'The National Church,' he says with fine irony, 'was deemed in the dark age of Queen Elizabeth, in the unenlightened times of Burleigh, Hooker, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Bacon, a great venerable estate of the realm ; but now by all the intellect of the kingdom it has been determined to be one of the many theological sects or communities established in the realm ; yet distinguished from the rest by having its priesthood endowed, *durante bene placito*, by favour of the Legislature. . . . The Church being thus reduced to a religion, religion *in genere*, is consequently separated from the Church, and made a subject of Parliamentary determination, independently of this Church.

The poor are withdrawn from the discipline of the Church. The education of the people is withdrawn from the ministry of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

'The Church of Christ asks of the State neither wages nor dignities. She asks only protection, and to be let alone. . . . The Church here spoken of is not *the kingdom of God which is within, and which cometh not with observation*, but is most observable—a *city built on a hill*, and not to be hid—the Church visible and militant under Christ.<sup>2</sup> . . . The Christian Church, as such, has no Nationality entrusted to its charge. It forms no counter-balance to the collective Heritage of the realm. The phrase, Church and State, has a sense and a propriety in reference to the National Church alone. The Church of Christ cannot be placed in this conjunction and *antithesis* without forfeiting the very name of Christian. The true and only contra-position of the Christian Church is to the world.<sup>3</sup> . . . The true Church of England is the National Church or Clerisy. There exists, God be thanked ! a Catholic and Apostolic Church in England ; and I thank God also for the constitutional and ancestral Church of England.<sup>4</sup> . . . The safest expression is, the Church of Christ in England, or the Catholic Church in England.<sup>5</sup> . . . The Scriptures, the Spirit, and the Church are coordinate ; the indispensable conditions and the working causes of the perpetuity and continued renaissance and spiritual life of Christ still militant.<sup>6</sup> . . . The Papacy elevated the Church to the virtual exclusion or suppression of the Scriptures ; the modern Church of England, since Chillingworth, has so raised up the Scriptures as to annul the Church ; both alike have quenched the Holy Spirit.<sup>7</sup>

It has been thought necessary to quote these passages out of many others to the same effect because, after Coleridge's death, some of his friends indignantly repudiated the idea that he in any way anticipated or helped on the great Church revival which arose shortly after his removal. It is idle to discuss what part he might have taken if he had been spared to see it : but it may be safely asserted that the friends of that movement could not have desired to see their principles on one point (and that the one which was the gist of all), better expressed than Coleridge has done. And on numberless other points it would be easy to show his anticipation of what a few years later was insisted upon by the Oxford School. But one would never know where to stop ; and, after all, it would only be like presenting a number of detached bricks as specimens of a building ; for the whole tone which pervades his later writings, especially the *Aids to Reflection*, strikes a Churchman far more forcibly than any

<sup>1</sup> *On the Constitution of the Church and State*, ch. vii. p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 126.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 127.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 136.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 135.

<sup>6</sup> *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Lit. Rem.* iii. 93.

particular passages do. One point seems to us to be very significant, viz. the marked change in the estimate which Coleridge took of Bishop Horsley. In his earlier life he had a strong prejudice against him; in his later life he thought very highly of him, speaking of him as 'the one red leaf, the last of its clan, with relation to the learned teachers of our Church, truly *pillars* within, and not merely "buttresses" of authority without.' Now, of all men in his day, Horsley was the most distinct, as he was certainly the most able exponent of Church principles. By 'the last of his clan,' Coleridge probably referred to those great divines of the seventeenth century to whom he clung with an ever-growing attachment. Jeremy Taylor is 'this most eloquent of divines—had I said of men, Cicero would forgive me, and Demosthenes nod assent;' <sup>1</sup> Leighton, 'perhaps, of all our learned Protestant theologians, best deserves the title of a spiritual divine;' <sup>2</sup> he is 'the evangelical, the apostolical Leighton. Next to the inspired Scriptures—yea, and as the vibration of that once-struck hour remaining on the air, stands Leighton's *Commentary on the First Epistle of S. Peter*.' <sup>3</sup> Field is 'an excellent divine, of whose work on the Church it would be difficult to speak too highly;' <sup>4</sup> and so on.

A word seems necessary on Coleridge's relation to the Evangelicals, who were without doubt the dominant party, so far as spiritual religion was concerned, in the early part of this century. There was one side of Evangelicalism or Methodism with which he deeply sympathized. His interesting annotations on his friend Southey's *Life of Wesley* show that he disagreed with the theory that the spiritual excitement of the early Methodists was mere fanaticism; and he wrote a pamphlet entitled *Notes on a Barrister's Hints on Evangelical Preaching*, strongly protesting against the barrister's abuse of the Methodists and Evangelicals. The following, from the *Aids to Reflection*, gives a wise warning:—

'Before you give way to the emotions of distaste or ridicule, which the prejudices of the circle in which you move, or your own familiarity with the mad perversions of the doctrine by fanatics in all ages, have connected with the very words, spirit, grace, gifts, operations, and the like . . . reflect again and again, and be sure you understand the doctrine before you determine on rejecting it. . . . If you have resolved that all belief of a Divine Comforter present to our inmost being, and aiding our infirmities, is forced and fanatical; if the Scriptures promising and asserting such communion are to be

<sup>1</sup> *Aids to Reflection*, i. 196.

<sup>2</sup> *Notes on English Divines*. ii. 120.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 113.

<sup>4</sup> *Aids*, p. 241.

explained away into the action of circumstances, and the necessary movements of the vast machine, in one of the circulating chains of which the human will is a petty link, in what better light can prayer appear to you than the groans of a wounded lion in his solitary den, or the howl of a dog with his eyes on the moon?' (p. 54).

On the other hand, he clearly saw the weakness of some who were called Evangelical, as the following passages show:—

'I am far from suspecting in you any participation in the prejudices of a shrivelled, proselyting, and censorious religionist. But a numerous and stirring faction there is, in the so-called Religious Public, whose actual and actuating principle, with whatever vehemence they may disclaim it in words, is that redemption is a thing not yet effected, that there is neither sense nor force in our baptism, and that instead of the apostolic command, "Rejoice, and again I say rejoice," baptised Christians are to put on sackcloth and ashes, and try, by torturing themselves and others, to procure a rescue from the devil.'<sup>1</sup>

And again:—

'When I hear a Bishop of the Church publicly exclaim (and not viewing it as a lesser inconvenience to be endured for the attainment of a far greater good, but as a thing desirable and to be preferred for its own sake), "No notes! no comment! Distribute the Bible and the Bible only among the poor," I should have been, had the declaration come from any other quarter, under the temptation of attributing it either to a fanatical notion of immediate illumination superseding the necessity of human teaching, or to an ignorance of difficulties which (and what more worthy?) have employed all the learning, sagacity, and unwearied labours of great and wise men and eminent servants of Christ during all the ages of Christianity.'<sup>2</sup>

Least of all had Coleridge any sympathy with the popular nostrums which in his declining years began to be recommended as substitutes for Christianity. They offended his taste no less than his piety. He regarded religion with the eye of a poet and of a philosopher. 'Religion is the poetry and philosophy of all mankind, and unites in itself whatever is most excellent in either.' This is the key-note of all his teaching, and perhaps explains the secret of his influence; for it was really the lesson which religious people in his day required to learn. But it is strange, considering the character of his works, that there should be such universal agreement about the influence which he *did* exercise. He wrote no systematic treatise on theology; nothing but a series of de-

<sup>1</sup> Gillman, p. 343.

<sup>2</sup> *Loy Sermon, addressed to Higher and Middle Classes.*

sultory, fragmentary remarks. But in those remarks he gave expression—and a very forcible expression—to ideas which were floating in the minds of thoughtful people. He was a powerful solvent in breaking up just those habits of mind which had led to the unsatisfactory state of things in the Church of his day. He acted as a sort of ζύμη; the leaven worked very slowly, and he died before it had penetrated through the mass. Change was in the air; and Coleridge gave a voice to the desire for change, and in more ways than one guided the direction which that change should take. It should also be remembered that one source of Coleridge's influence cannot in the nature of the case be fully realised by posterity. Suggestive as his writings were, his conversation appears to have been still more striking. Who can tell what were the effects of those conversations, or rather monologues, of the sage at Highgate, to which spot the most thoughtful men of the day were wont to make pilgrimages? The fascination which he had exercised as a talker in his youth, and which led the host of the 'Salutation and Cat' to offer him free quarters, in the confidence that his conversation would more than recoup the loss by attracting guests to his hostelry, survived to the close of life. It was no perfect character that men came to see and hear talk at the house of the good surgeon, Mr. Gillman, but a man who had contracted a fatal habit, the attempt to cure which had brought him there; a man whose domestic relations had been far from happy; a man who had never been able, partly through indolence, partly through physical infirmity, to devote himself to systematic work, even to the extent of earning his bread: but a splendid man with all his faults; 'an archangel a little damaged,' to use the words of one admirer;<sup>1</sup> 'this astonishing man,' according to another;<sup>2</sup> 'a sublime man, who alone in those dark days had saved his crown of spiritual manhood; a king of men,' according to a third.<sup>3</sup>

To us, as Churchmen, there is something very touching in the thought of the silver-haired sage who had sounded all the depths of philosophy, and almost boxed the theological compass, breathing in his old age an *esto perpetua* to the Church which in his hot youth he had reviled. In that Church, weary with the heat and dust of controversy, he found a safe and quiet rest for his soul. What better advice can we give to other restless and unsettled spirits than 'Follow the example of this most honest and fearless seeker after truth and *antiquam exquirite matrem*'?

<sup>1</sup> Charles Lamb.<sup>2</sup> Thomas de Quincey.<sup>3</sup> Thomas Carlyle.



### ART. V.—THE ROMAN QUESTION— RIVINGTON AND GORE.

1. *Authority, or a Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome.* By LUKE RIVINGTON, M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford. (London, 1888.)
2. *Roman Catholic Claims.* By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House; Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln. (London, 1889.)

THE Rev. Luke Rivington, after spending many years of self-denying and energetic service in the Church of England, has thought it his duty to conform to the Church of Rome. The sentiments, with which we regard many who have thus left us, were expressed almost forty years ago in a sermon preached at Oxford before the days of Mr. Rivington's connexion with that University:—

‘It may happen, and does happen, that the system in which we ourselves are—and which, we trust, is a true and living portion of Christ’s one Visible Catholic Church—may become doubted of and left by some for another system which claims that august title either as more rightly, or as exclusively. It is when those who are dear to us take this step that, however we may condemn their act, a comfortable thought is suggested about themselves which saves us from the pain of a necessarily harsh judgment respecting them, or of much necessary anxiety of fear on their own account. Those who grieve for relations or friends thus parted from their religious fellowship may first throw themselves back on the remembrance how earnestly and with what singleness of aim such were in their hitherto life striving to do God’s will; then they may consider and apply to their case what has been said above of the infinite variety of position to each individual with respect to revealed truth as an object held before them; how imperfectly the title and claim of the system in which they were brought up and which they have left may have been really presented to the mind of each, under the variety of teaching and reading of which each had opportunity; further, the notion of the other possible hindrance may be applied in like manner—the hindrance from within from their subjective powers; the consideration may be added of the natural character of their minds rendering them perhaps less competent to take in what might fairly be said in behalf of dutifully remaining where they were; perhaps also liable (beyond their consciousness) to be unduly influenced by some of the motives and arguments by which the new system which succeeded in winning them recommended itself to their acceptance. And, to

crow  
err  
high  
full  
syste  
igno  
in so  
safe

diff  
as  
tho  
of  
of v  
opin  
tha  
adv

sho  
has  
app  
it m  
bef

So  
be  
mu  
wor  
whi  
Ro  
alto  
Pop  
(Gr  
doc  
of  
as  
a d

bef  
Nov  
New

Oxe  
Let  
For  
Div

crown all, there would come in the conclusion about involuntary errors—that none such should perish, whatever they might lose of higher amount of blessing ; that it is not the question in their case of full union with Christ or no union at all ; that a wrongly preferred system may have virtue in its Sacraments for those who in blameless ignorance wander from their Providential home, virtue to unite them in some degree at least to Him, union with Whom in any degree is safety eternal.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Rivington may have rendered it somewhat more difficult for us to apply this passage to his case, inasmuch as he has published a defence of his new position, which, though able and pointed, appears to us to exhibit marks of haste, of want of judgment, and, we fear we must say, of want of knowledge. Still we must not forget that our own opinion in such matters cannot be an unbiassed one, and that we too may be in danger of doing injustice to an able adversary.

This small volume of less than 120 pages is occupied in showing the seeming weakness of the communion which he has left, and the strength of that which he has joined. We approach the subject from such different points of view that it may be well to intimate some features of such difference before we proceed to details.

We believe that we are living in a divided Christendom. So far as words go, Mr. Rivington would probably thus far be with us. But he would hardly mean the same thing, inasmuch as Christian communities outside the Roman obedience would not be considered by him a portion of that Church which Christ our Lord has founded. This, however, even in Rome itself, is a comparatively modern view. For, waiving altogether for the moment the question of Anglicanism, the Popes who summoned the Councils of Lyons and Florence (Gregory X. and Eugenius IV.) speak throughout their official documents of 'the union of the Western and Eastern Church,' of 'uniting the Church of God,'<sup>2</sup> thus recognizing the Orientals as a part of that Church. And certainly those who believe in a divided Christendom must consider it *à priori* probable

<sup>1</sup> *The Laws of our Knowledge of Doctrinal Truth.* A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's Church, on Sunday, November 17, 1850. By William Beadon Heathcote, B.C.L., Fellow of New College, Oxford. (Oxford: Parker, 1850.) Pp. 24, 25.

<sup>2</sup> We here avail ourselves of the language of the late Mr. H. N. Oxenham in a note appended to his translation of Dr. von Döllinger's *Letters on the Reunion of the Churches* (London: Rivingtons, 1872), p. 151. For detailed evidence Mr. Oxenham refers to Ffoulkes's *Christendom's Divisions*, pt. ii. pp. 259-261, 337-340.

that different portions would have their own strong and their own weak points, their own peculiar advantages and defects. He who quits one portion for another will obtain in a measure freedom from certain evils which may have distressed and harassed him; and yet it is quite possible—this is no mere theory, but it has been abundantly and sometimes painfully illustrated in actual life—that he may discover in after years that he would have done wisely to act upon the principle—

‘Rather bear those ills we have  
Than fly to others that we know not of.’

If the remarkable and often-quoted testimony of the ultramontane De Maistre be true, that the English Church is *very precious*, as offering the best hopes of an agency for reuniting Christendom, because she touches the sectaries on one hand and Rome on the other, then she must perforce allow within her pale a very considerable measure of liberty, which will at times be in danger of degenerating into licence. That this licence does exist at the present moment, nay, that it is somewhat extreme, and that it needs a certain degree of pruning, we willingly admit, though we trust, before we have finished, to show some countervailing evidence even here. Mr. Ffoulkes has said that, ‘as a general rule, Roman Catholics are weak where Anglicans are strongest, and strong where Anglicans fail.’<sup>1</sup> One result of that licence has been the curious circumstance that both Rome and Dissent have gained through recruits won from the English Church. Of the distinguished persons gained by Rome we may say something presently. It is not always equally observed that Baxter, Whitfield, and John Wesley were all nurtured in the bosom of the English Church, and set apart for the ministry by the benediction of her bishops upon their brows. That our lack of discipline, that the unsatisfactory state of our Church courts should render us humble and charitable, when we criticize the condition of other communions, may be true; but it is possible to have too much of authority. There was a time in the Middle Ages when ecclesiastical authority held at its beck and call the repressive authority of the State. Did it succeed in eliminating error from the human mind? We answer in the words of Cardinal Newman:—

‘The heresies of the East germinated in the West of Europe and in Catholic lecture-rooms with a mysterious vigour upon which history throws no light. . . . There will be, I say, in spite of you unbelief and immorality to the end of the world, and you must be prepared

<sup>1</sup> *Christendom's Divisions.*

for immorality more odious, and unbelief more astute, more subtle, more bitter, and more resentful, in proportion as it is obliged to dissemble.<sup>1</sup>

The nineteenth century is unlike the thirteenth; but we are compelled to say that if ever we feel inclined to see good points in the Anglican discipline and Anglican Church courts of our time it is when we read of such a process as Mr. Ffoulkes underwent during the period of his life wherein he was a member of the Church of Rome.<sup>2</sup> And meanwhile our hopes for an improvement in the way of union among ourselves and for better discipline have been, notwithstanding some drawbacks, powerfully fostered by the general tone of the Lambeth Conference and of the Manchester Congress.

Having indicated his preference for an authority like that of Rome, rather than for the comparative freedom of the English Church, Mr. Rivington proceeds to touch upon the question of jurisdiction. And at this point we feel it to be a duty to express our deep gratitude to those divines of our own communion who have of late years turned their attention to the question of the Succession in the Church of England, such as the lamented Arthur Haddan, Dr. Littledale, Mr. Morse,<sup>3</sup> and others. So effective has been their work that there is at length a turn of the tide, and writers like Mr. Rivington feel compelled to direct their inquiry to the question of jurisdiction rather than to that of Orders.

Nevertheless we must, in passing, place on record our sense of deep regret at the tone in which the assault on the Anglican Succession has in some quarters been carried on. Most especially are we grieved at the line which, on two separate occasions, was adopted by Cardinal Newman. In a letter addressed to Father Coleridge<sup>4</sup> on August 5, 1868, he

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on University Subjects*, pp. 298-9 (London: Longmans, 1859). The writer is speaking of the early part of the thirteenth century.

<sup>2</sup> *Macmillan's Magazine* for January 1882, art. 'English Church Courts and Primitive Ritual.'

<sup>3</sup> *Apostolical Succession: a Plain Treatise on Holy Orders and Jurisdiction in the Church of England* (London: Skeffington, 1887).

<sup>4</sup> See *The Month*, September and October 1868, pp. 269, 417. In a book written by a Roman Catholic, who is fiercely anti-Anglican, we find a very high-toned remonstrance issued in A.D. 1325 by Walter Reynolds, Archbishop of Canterbury. After speaking in words of much beauty on the proper preparation for the reception of the Holy Eucharist, the author proceeds [we are responsible for the italics] :—

'But alas! the sons of feasting and of gluttony, whose god is their belly, long since introduced into the holy Church this abuse, that immediately after they have received the Lord's Body on Easter Day they have served to them unconsecrated bread and wine, and there sit down eating

appeared to admit that he could not formally disprove the validity of Anglican ordination; but that he thought it most probably invalid, because of the conduct of so many who had received such ordination. Dr. Dollinger once remarked to a friend of the present writer, that if Dr. Newman had been as well versed in mediæval Church history as he is in early Church history he would never have joined the Church of Rome. This is probably a case in point. The Cardinal's argument would go far to invalidate the ordination of many a mediæval priest, of many a later Gallican abbé. More recently he supplied a preface to the volume by Father Hutton of the Oratory on the Anglican ministry (Lond. 1879). It struck us when we read that work that the way in which history was treated in its pages would tend, if carried out to its legitimate results, to throw doubt upon all historic investigation, and it was with sorrow, but without the slightest surprise, that we learned that Mr. Hutton had, a few years after the publication of his book, renounced his belief in Christianity.

Mr. Rivington, as is natural under the circumstances, takes up the latest fashion. 'It [the Church of England] may have its orders and valid sacraments' (p. 13); accordingly he declines to discuss these matters, but passes on to that of jurisdiction. 'The question of jurisdiction is simpler' (Preface); that is to say, that if we will interpret the words of our Lord at the Sea of Tiberias, as recorded by St. John (xxi. 15-17),

and drinking as in a tavern—a source of many disorders. Thus some push forward to receive the Eucharist, that they may get sooner to the feasting; or, if the clerks are more generous with some, the rest threaten and murmur against them; and, worse than this, some of the simpler sort, misled by the form of bread in what they have first received, and not knowing how to distinguish between material food and that of the soul, which is the Body of Christ, fall into dangerous errors against faith, as we have too much reason to fear.'

The editor of the book comments as follows:—

'It may seem to some who read this decree, that the men guilty of such conduct could not have had faith in the Real Presence. No doubt they did not discern the Lord's Body as it should be discerned, with their moral faculties. *But it would be most unphilosophical to conclude against a man's faith from the extravagant inconsistency of his conduct.* Do none of those who sin believe in the omnipresence of God? Or, to take a case directly in point, where scurrilous games are carried on at the wake of a corpse, does the misguided company not believe in death or judgment?'—*History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain.* By T. E. Bridgett, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, vol. ii. pp. 42, 43 (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1881).

In this instance the fault lay with the laity; but it would be only too easy to give parallel instances among the mediæval and post-Reformation Roman clergy. This is, however, not a pleasing task, and we refrain from entering upon it unless specially challenged to undertake it.

in the Roman manner, and further will admit that the Bishop of Rome inherits every prerogative of St. Peter, we must needs grant all that follows, and accept 'the view now generally held' among Roman Catholics that the apostles, though they received their jurisdiction immediately from Christ, did not transmit it, and that the bishops and their successors receive their jurisdiction from Christ, but through Peter.<sup>1</sup> Of course, if these inferences can be really drawn from the concluding chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, the occupants of the sees of Jerusalem, Moscow, Constantinople, Canterbury, with all their suffragans, are usurpers; but such consequences are felt to be extravagant, and there still exist even Roman Catholics who decline to accept them, and who maintain that bishops do derive their jurisdiction immediately from Christ, though they claim for the Pope a right to restrain and even in some cases to take away this right. Even here again the Church history recorded in Holy Scripture fails to give any countenance to such a view. What jurisdiction, for example, did St. Peter exercise over St. Paul? How is it that the Apostles collectively send St. Peter and St. John to Samaria? (Acts viii. 14); and why is St. Peter, despite his primacy, which we fully admit, called upon to explain his conduct in having had familiar intercourse and partaking of food with men uncircumcised? (Acts xi. 2-17). Why, again, is he rebuked by St. Paul (Gal. ii. 11-14) when he has been acting in a manner inconsistent with his previous explanation? Gallican divines have dwelt with much force upon the relative positions of St. Peter and St. James at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 1-29), where St. James appears to sum up and express the mind of the assembly. Why, moreover, does no shadow of a hint in the direction of those claims appear in either of the two epistles bequeathed to the Church by St. Peter? And as for the *simplicity* of the question in connexion with the history of the early Church and the mediæval Church, the less said the better. The case of Liberius, Bishop of Rome, is *not* simple and easy. The case of Honorius is *not* simple and easy; nor are those three gaps on which Dr. Littledale has dwelt in the acute chapter on Jurisdiction contained in his *Words for Truth*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [*Roman*] *Catholic Dictionary* of Messrs. Addis and Arnold (London: Kegan Paul and Co., 1884), art. 'Jurisdiction.'

<sup>2</sup> London: Kent and Co., 1888, No. ix. p. 75 *et seqq.* Although our previous references to the New Testament are familiar ones, yet we owe something to Dr. Littledale for his clear re-statements of them (*ibid.* p. 89). The reader will do well to refer to the *Words for Truth*. Among other weighty observations may be specially noticed the author's reference to



We have had hopes of finding an opportunity of discussing more in detail the historic and patristic elements which Mr. Rivington has borrowed largely (with full acknowledgment, be it said) from the larger and more elaborate volumes of Mr. Allies, and had consequently intended to reserve the whole of these topics for a separate article, which should criticise Mr. Allies rather than his follower. But at this point an early copy of the work of the Rev. Charles Gore, entitled *Roman Catholic Claims*, has reached us, and its great merits induce us to supply our readers with a brief epitome of its contents, which will in some degree anticipate what we had reserved for a future occasion.

Mr. Gore, in his preface, naturally directs attention to the way in which Mr. Rivington has quietly assumed that Sir Thomas More and St. Francis de Sales possessed all the *data* which *we* possess for discernment of the truth concerning the authority of the Roman See, Mr. Rivington asserting (*Authority*, p. 4) that 'there are no new literary discoveries of any importance about the early centuries of the Christian Church.' Mr. Gore reminds his readers that in the times of those justly-honoured defenders of Rome, the fabric of the Isidorian decretals had hardly been assailed; that the text of St. Cyprian had not been freed from interpolations; that the *Refutatio* of St. Hippolytus was unknown; that the Benedictine excision of vast quantities of spurious matter from the patristic writings had not even been commenced. He further re-states the admissions about St. Peter's primacy, which so many Anglican divines have made, and rightly questions the possibility of settling large issues, such as those between Rome and England, on a narrow foundation, instead of on a broad and general survey of the entire case.

At the commencement of his volume Mr. Gore sets forth the argument on behalf of the *via media* of Anglicanism, making full admission of that good and beneficial side of work and life to which the history of the Roman Church bears witness, but at the same time pointing out her weaknesses, as, for example, in that general ignorance of Holy Scripture which the Roman Catholic M. Henri Lasserre has of late so strikingly proclaimed and so earnestly sought to remedy by his French version of the Holy Gospels. The small amount of aid to be derived from modern Rome in *exegesis* and in the battle against rationalism is also dwelt upon. A second chapter ably describes the Anglican view concerning the unity of the Church.

the admission of Roman Catholic divines that even failure of jurisdiction does not invalidate the sacramental ordinances.

And here we come across a surely novel theory, much insisted on by Mr. Rivington, that 'to talk of a body without a head *in the same order of life* as the rest of the body, is to use words without meaning.'<sup>1</sup> Father Gallwey, going quite as far as Mr. Rivington, perhaps a shade further, declares that the Head, which the quasi-Gnostic heretics, as St. Paul complains, did not hold fast (Coloss. ii. 19), does not mean the Invisible Head, Christ, and that only 'a Low Churchman or Dissenter ought to say so.' Mr. Gore justly replies that in this matter 'we may safely be Low Churchmen or Dissenters in company with St. Augustine, and the Fathers, and the best Roman commentators.' To which we must add that Mr. Rivington seems to forget, not only that Holy Scripture always applies to our Lord, *and to Him only*, the title of Head of the Church (Ephes. v. 23; Coloss. i. 18), as also of Head of our race (1 Cor. xi. 3), but that theologians maintain that it is in virtue of His sacred humanity that He holds this office, and that consequently He is, thus far, a Head *in the same order of life as the rest of the body*. And if Mr. Rivington and Father Gallwey assert this to be ultra-Protestant theology, we would beg to refer them to the *Summa Theologiæ* of St. Thomas Aquinas. In the third part of that famous work the great schoolman, stating first (according to his wont) the negative proposition, which he means to answer and confute, elaborately demolishes the false declaration—*quod Christo, secundum quod est homo, non competat esse caput Ecclesiæ*<sup>2</sup>—though, of course, in arguing thus he does not forget that our Lord's personality resides in His Divinity.

<sup>1</sup> P. 5. The italics are Mr. Rivington's.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa Theologiæ*, pars iii. quaestio 8, art. i. Compare, also, in the same part Quæstiones 48, 49. The late Bishop Forbes of Brechin wrote a brief but beautiful comment on this point in a sermon published in 1848, entitled *Jesus our Worship* (London: Masters). As this discourse may not be very accessible we subjoin a portion of the passage. 'Moreover it is in His human nature that our blessed Lord is Head of the Church. All the intimate and endearing associations which that holy bond of union implies come from thence. It is in this that, in its highest and most mysterious sense, the Communion of Saints obtains. Through it the tabernacle of God is with men, and He dwells with them. Through it we are united to Him, in a most blessed and mysterious union, beyond what thought can conceive, or words express, for we are members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones. Through it we are in Christ, and Christ in us—Christ living in us, and there being no condemnation for them that are in Him. . . . Hence the glorious privileges of the Church of Christ; hence the mystical washing away of sin in the laver of regeneration; hence the intimate relations between the Creator and the created in the Sacrament of the Lord's Body; hence the remission of sin, the resurrection of the flesh, and everlasting life after death.'

Lack of space compels us to pass but lightly over the very able chapter of Mr. Gore on 'The Authority of the Church.' We may, however, particularly invite attention to his illustrations of the manner in which the primitive Church was compelled, with pain and toil, to seek out truth when error was abroad; how unconscious of the very existence of such a tribunal as the Papacy, as a single test of truth, were the majority of the Fathers of the first six centuries after Christ; and how utterly such a guide was lacking, not only during the subtle assaults of Gnosticism, but even under the terrible pressure of Arianism. If the Church for three hundred years had no Œcumenical councils, it may be in God's providence that she should live without them now; and of course it is quite possible, as Mr. Gore suggests, that it was not intended 'that the formulation of Œcumenical dogmas should go beyond defining the basis of the Christian faith and life, as it is given us in the Creeds.'

The chapter on 'The Bible in the Church' follows very much the lines of Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Rule of Faith,<sup>1</sup> to which, indeed, our author refers his readers. There is great force in Mr. Gore's concluding pages concerning the way in which even Roman Catholics must suppose that error has long been prevalent. They must, for example, consider that Aquinas (and perhaps St. Bernard) erred in not admitting the dogma (as they now call it) of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, and that the whole Gallican school were in error concerning Papal infallibility, a doctrine which *Keenan's Catechism*<sup>2</sup> asserted to be 'a Protestant invention' and 'no article of the Catholic faith.' Of St. Peter's position we had already written briefly before the receipt of Mr. Gore's volume, and we must leave it for the present, just referring our readers to the pages both of Dr. Littledale and Mr. Gore. Respecting the admission by Dean Milman of the good work done by Rome during the Middle Ages, and the seeming necessity of such a power, we may observe that it has also been made by Bishop Lightfoot and, we believe, by Bishop Harold

<sup>1</sup> *University Sermons*, 1843-1855, No. VI., new edition, Oxford, 1879.

<sup>2</sup> This well-known book has been circulated by thousands under episcopal authority. The words quoted above are an answer to the question, 'Is the Pope himself infallible?' It has been found convenient for obvious reasons to suppress both question and answer in recent issues! See Dr. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 25 (London), 1888. In speaking of the same doctrine Alban Butler remarks that 'no Catholic looks upon it as an article or term of communion. . . . No such article is proposed by the Church or required of anyone' (*Account of the Life and Writings of Alban Butler*, sect. iii. p. 9, ed. 1798).

Browne. Undoubtedly we owe a great deal to Rome. There is not probably any communion that names the Name of Christ, from which there is not something to be learnt; and it would be strange indeed if that really wonderful institution, which touches the human mind at so many points, formed any exception to this rule.

On the questions concerning the nature of schism Mr. Gore writes with much calmness and equity. To his reasonings on the share of blame—known, as he truly says, only to God—which must be attributed to each side in the division between East and West, between Roman and Reformed, we will only add one piece of evidence, of which the genuineness is unquestioned.

'We know,' said Pope Urban VIII., when urged to excommunicate the Kings of France and Sweden about the year 1641, 'that we may declare them excommunicate, as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth of England, and before him Clement VII. the King of England, Henry VIII. . . . but with what success? The whole world can tell; *we yet bewail it with tears of blood.* Wisdom doth not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement VII., but Paul V., who, in the beginning, being many times urged by the Spaniards to excommunicate James, King of England, never would consent to it.'<sup>1</sup>

The chapter on Anglican ordinations adds to the evidence adduced by the writers mentioned in the earlier part of this article the remarkable concessions made by Canon Estcourt (one of the few serious reasoners against the validity of Anglican orders) as regards the form of the English Prayer-Book, and ably answers the same writer on the subject of the doctrine of intention. He further expresses his obligations to Mr. Gladstone's paper on the 'Elizabethan Settlement of Religion,' of which he has made good use.<sup>2</sup>

Lastly, against defects arising out of the reaction against excessive mediævalism our author has to place the sad extravagances in which Roman Catholics still indulge. He is able to quote language from a devotional work sanctioned by Cardinal Manning, which goes dangerously near suggesting that the satisfaction made once for all on Mount Calvary is incomplete. Subsequently Mr. Gore writes as follows:—

'Further than this, however much there may be to be regretted and reformed in the teaching and practice of the Anglican Church at the present day, I must in fairness say that there is no even

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Cardinal Newman in his 'Letter to the Duke of Norfolk,' from a Report in the State Paper Office, *Italy*, 1641-1662. The pontificate of Urban VIII. lasted from A.D. 1623 to 1644.

<sup>2</sup> *Nineteenth Century*, July 1888.

unauthorized practice of the English Church which I had not as soon be responsible for as for that withdrawal of the chalice from the laity, to which the whole authority of the Church of Rome is committed : that I have never heard a sermon in an English Church more to be regretted than one it was once my lot to hear in Strasburg Cathedral, in which Christ was preached as the revelation of Divine justice, and Mary as the revelation of Divine love : I have not read in Anglican biography anything which I should more desire to disown than Mother Margaret Mary Hallahan's description of the Pope saying Mass : "When I heard him sing Mass I cannot express what I felt : it was the God of earth prostrate in adoration before the God of heaven"! I have not been confronted in an Anglican book of devotion with any prayer more impossible to pray than

"Soul of the Virgin, illuminate me,  
Body of the Virgin, guard me,  
Milk of the Virgin, feed me,  
Passage of the Virgin, strengthen me ;  
O Mary, mother of grace, intercede for me ;  
For thy servant take me ;  
Make me always to trust in thee ;  
From all evils protect me ;  
In the hour of my death assist me ;  
And prepare for me a safe way to thee ;  
That with all the elect I may glorify thee ;  
For ever and ever."

'Thus, all things considered, we Anglicans thank God that He has put us elsewhere than in the Roman Church, though we would fain give her an ungrudging recognition of her glories, and are very far from believing that all, even of her educated members, need be conscious of that temper in her modern theology which to us is so intolerable' (pp. 172-3).

And here, with much gratitude, we part from Mr. Gore's short but very valuable volume, though not without fear that our epitome of its contents, made under some pressure of haste, may have done injustice to the force of his arguments and the worth of his labours. The best way of correcting any such evil will consist on the part of our readers in a study of the book itself, and such a course we strongly recommend. We might have dwelt much on the *addendum* to p. 18 n., given at the close of the Preface. And we might, with Mr. Gore's assistance, have entered upon the patristic part of Mr. Rivington's volume. But the latter task (as has already been implied) we purposely postpone, because we hope that it may some day be possible for us to discuss the history of the Council of Chalcedon. This would at once bring us across the question of Mr. Rivington's patristic references, because they are much mixed up with the assertions of Mr. Allies. Meanwhile, as

Mr. Rivington's pages show, there are grave reasons for utterly mistrusting the solidity of the whole of that ingenious fabric which Mr. Allies and his disciple have attempted to rear.

But we now pass on to certain considerations, which we had intended to bring forward, before Mr. Gore's volume came into our hands.

These topics are as follows : (1) The supposition that those who conscientiously decline to admit the Roman claims must accuse the Bishops of Rome of having been deliberate and conscious impostors. (2) The supposition that on quitting the English Church for the Roman a man escapes from all the special difficulties which affect the theology of our day. (3) The supposition that a list of eminent men who have during the last half-century become Roman Catholics is a fact which stands unbalanced, and which ought consequently to operate in one direction only.

(1.) Mr. Allies quotes, and Mr. Rivington re-quotes, the following dictum : ' Either the Popes claimed what was their right by the gift of Christ, or they were one and all impostors from the beginning ' (Rivington, p. 57).

Is it really impossible, then, for holy and able men to claim more than they ought? We read in the thirteenth century that certain bishops in France demanded that persons excommunicated by them should receive immediate punishment at the hand of the State. That claim was resisted. By whom? Was it by some fierce and unbelieving despot? No; it was by King Louis IX., the canonized saint, the pattern ruler, the model of justice, ' the noblest and holiest of monarchs.'<sup>1</sup> Oh, but, it may be rejoined, these were bishops of particular sees which have no immunity from such error. The Bishop of Rome is in a different position; he could not possibly act in this manner.

It is, we think, in our power to test this assertion by reference to a single department of the history of ecclesiastical pretensions which, though (we grant) not precisely *in pari materia* with the doctrinal claim, yet at least serves to illustrate the point at issue. Although Mr. Rivington does not seem to us to be widely read in history, we may fairly assume that he has heard of a claim on the part of the Roman Pontiffs, which is commonly known as *the deposing power*. Now by no means do we believe that this imagined right had its origin in fraud or in ambition. The uneducated at certain periods

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire de Saint Louis*, par Jean, Sire de Joinville, §§ 61-4 (ed. De Wailly, Paris, 1874). Hallam justly observes that ' Joinville is a witness whom, when we listen to him, we must believe.'



do frame a most exalted notion of what education can accomplish. Even a country curate, fairly trained, may have found himself requested to draw up a will, and to pronounce an opinion concerning the value of a particular medicine (which he is begged to taste) as a specific for the illness of a parishioner, although he is conscious that his attainments in the provinces of law and medicine are of a very subordinate and humble character. And thus in the ages when the Roman primacy had developed into a supremacy, the bishop of that see found himself either directly, or else indirectly through legates or other representatives, invited to decide between rival claimants to a throne. The most obvious and famous case is that of Pippin in A.D. 749. Childeric III. had a shadowy sovereignty, which, though deprived of all real power, might easily become the focus of revolutionary movements on the part of discontented chieftains, who were in turn allying themselves with Germans, with Saxons, with Bavarians.

'Burchard, Bishop of Würzburg,' writes Einhard, 'and Folrad, priest and chaplain, were sent to Rome to Pope Zachary, to consult the Pontiff concerning the kings who then existed in France, and who had only the name of kings without any royal power. Through them the Pontiff replied that it were better that he should be king who exercised the royal power; and having sanctioned this by his authority, it came to pass that Pepin was appointed king.'<sup>1</sup>

Similar proceedings, though on a smaller scale, may be traced in other histories of mediæval times, as, for example, in Mr. Green's *Short History of the English People*.<sup>2</sup>

But from such interference legitimately invited and applied, how easy, alas! the step to meddling where no such warrant existed; where there was either no invitation at all, or only an invitation which bore on its very face the stamp of hypocrisy. The deposing power was by the sixteenth century all but erected into an article of faith. Cruel and bitter as we must allow the conduct of Elizabeth of England to have often been, the one palliation for her cruelty is to be found in the conduct of those Pontiffs who, while the Roman Catholics in England were assuring the Queen that they acknowledged her as their sovereign both *de jure* and *de facto*, were sending emissaries armed with Bulls which denounced her as bastard and usurper, and which placed her life in constant peril of assassination. The statements of the authors of *Janus*<sup>3</sup> on the Papal claims

<sup>1</sup> *Einhardii Annales Francorum, sub anno 750* (ed. Teulet, Paris, 1840, vol. i. p. 126).

<sup>2</sup> London: Macmillan and Co., 1875 (twenty-third edition).

<sup>3</sup> *The Pope and the Council*, pp. 13, 14, 382-7. English translation. (London: Rivingtons, 1869.)

in this sphere of action can be thoroughly illustrated from the history of Elizabeth by the Roman Catholic Lingard,<sup>1</sup> who gives us the touching and (in this matter) anti-papal petition of those loyal Roman Catholics who subsequently vindicated their loyalty by their zeal against the Spanish Armada. The same author also notices the absurd inconsistency of Philip of Spain. For Philip had not hesitated to declare war against Pope Paul IV., and had by his general, the famous Duke of Alva, dictated the terms of peace in the Vatican. 'He ought,' says the historian, 'to have been the last to acknowledge in the Pontiff the right of disposing of the crowns of princes;' but 'revenge and ambition taught him a different lesson;' and he planned, with the sanction and co-operation of Pope Sixtus V., that expedition which was doomed to such a signal failure.

And now, in this year of grace 1888, how stands the Roman claim to the deposing power? Cardinal Newman has informed us in his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* (p. 51) that if he were a Privy Councillor or Member of Parliament, bound by his oath as such not to acknowledge the right of succession of a Prince of Wales, if he became a Catholic, and if the Pope called upon him to stand up for the Catholic Succession, he could not obey him so long as he continued in office or in his place in Parliament. Roman encyclopedists<sup>2</sup> place against the judgment of Bellarmine, Ferraris, and others in favour of this alleged right, those of Duperron, Gerson, and many more who 'do not admit that it has any root in the *depositum fidei*;' nay, they avow 'that there is no longer any question, even at Rome, of exercising the deposing power;' and they quote the words of the late Pope Pío Nono, who is reported to have said in a sermon that, 'No one now thinks any more of the right of deposing princes, which the Holy See formerly exercised, and the supreme Pontiff even less than anyone.'

It might be too much to expect, that a claim so solemnly exercised again and again by Bishops of Rome should be allowed by their successors to have been all along of a most questionable character. But even Mr. Rivington may be able to imagine that students of history, who have lived to witness the practical withdrawal of an alleged right, which yet they do

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, vol. vi. pp. 188, 244. Sixth edit. (London: 1854.)

<sup>2</sup> See the article 'Deposing Power' in the *Dictionary* of Messrs. Addis and Arnold, the former of whom has recently left the Church of Rome.

not believe to have been made by impostors, can also suppose it possible that doctrinal claims may have been partly fostered in a like manner. Assuredly modern opponents of the Papal claims have not always attributed the rise of her power to imposture or to unworthy arts. 'Rome,' said the late Professor Hussey (in his small but able volume *against* the Supremacy), 'at this time, and for some time afterwards, had earned the precedence in honour always allowed to the Imperial See, not only by her martyred bishops and her munificence to poorer Churches, but also by her orthodoxy, and by the courage and ability with which she undertook the championship of the truth against various shapes of error.'<sup>1</sup> And another writer of different temperament has avowed, in his critique of J. H. Newman's *Essay on Development*, that 'The Bishop of Rome . . . had a special, most awful, most responsible stewardship entrusted to him, in the discharge of which it is mere arrogance, party spirit, and contempt of history to say he was not often in the main faithful.'<sup>2</sup>

(2.) But, says Mr. Rivington, concerning the communion which he has left, 'The Church of England is wavering even on the subject of hell' (p. 13).

Has he really studied this question in connexion with the history of the communion which he has joined? We greatly doubt it.

We have spoken of the opposite dangers, the opposite merits and demerits, of different religious bodies. Let us now add that there do occur in the history of the world, whether regarded from a political or an ecclesiastical point of view, waves of thought which affect parties the most opposite. The most acute lay supporter of Ultramontanism, Count Joseph de Maistre, was well aware of this fact. He saw that the French Revolution had rendered impossible a restoration of seventeenth and eighteenth century views concerning monarchy; and that the Reformation had acted similarly upon religion. 'Toute grande révolution agit toujours plus ou moins sur ceux mêmes qui lui résistent, et ne permet plus le rétablissement total des anciennes idées. Nous le voyons par la commotion religieuse du XVII<sup>ème</sup> siècle, qui a opéré une révolution très-sensible même chez les Catholiques.'<sup>3</sup>

Some such revolution as this has, during the present cen-

<sup>1</sup> Hussey's *Rise of the Papal Power*, p. 11, Oxford edit., 1863.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. F. D. Maurice's Preface to *Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. xli. (London, 1846.)

<sup>3</sup> We have, unfortunately, mislaid our reference. But the passage is quite undisputed and breathes De Maistre's style in every word.

tury, affected the questions which concern *eschatology*. If any persons imagine that Roman Catholic divinity has been untouched by it, they must, either from carelessness or from wilfulness, be singularly blind.

Speaking merely for himself, the present writer has for a quarter of a century espoused in published articles and letters what may be called, on these topics, the conservative side. He believes that Universalism, if men could on a large scale *really* convince themselves of it, would be the destruction of religion; and when told by this or that semi-supporter of it—*thorough* supporters are rare—that it has a strong case, he has been accustomed to ask, 'Do you then believe that we are all to be forced to go to heaven, whether we like it or not?' The perception that an affirmative reply involves the denial of our free agency, for the most part, makes men pause.<sup>1</sup>

Greek and Roman authors, with the doubtful exception of Cicero, either deny a future life at all, or else in admitting a world to come recognize the existence both of heaven and of hell. The idea that an eternal loss militated against the mercy of the Creator never once seems to have crossed their imaginations.

But Christianity wrought an alteration here. Here and there, even in the primitive Church, some whispers of difficulty are heard, although by the close of the sixth century they seem to be generally silenced. Yet in the Middle Ages Aquinas appears to be able to claim some support from Augustine on behalf of the lawfulness of the theory of mitigation: a theory which we for our part believe to be perfectly permissible, as a pious opinion.<sup>2</sup>

Among post-Reformation divines Rodriguez and Lessius occupy conspicuous places. Both are conservative *de Aeternitate Penarum*; and, in truth, it has been forcibly asserted that

'to deny it is to revolutionize the Christian system, as may be seen, e.g., by applying the process of expurgation to such classical works as the *Confessions* of Augustine, the *Sermons* of Chrysostom, the

<sup>1</sup> This element of the case has been forcibly urged by Dr. Pusey and by Mr. Mallock, also by Professor Paget in *Oxford House Papers*.

<sup>2</sup> Mitigation means a merciful diminution of punishment. 'Non totaliter poena tolletur, sed, ipsâ poenâ durante, misericordia operabitur eam diminuendo' (*Summa Theol. Suppl. Qu. 99, art. 2 ad 4*); and he can appeal to at least one passage in Augustine which ends as follows: 'non ut eas poenas vel nunquam subeant, vel aliquando finiant, sed ut eas mitiores quam merita sunt eorum levioresque patiantur' (*in Psalmum lxxvii. 8*, in Augustine's reckoning, Psalm lxxvi.).

*Imitation of à-Kempis, Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living and Dying, or Baxter's Saints' Everlasting Rest.*<sup>1</sup>

Passing by some objectors among English Deists and Socinians and their opponents (as e.g. Dr. Horbery and others), we turn our gaze across to France. During the earlier half of the nineteenth century there appeared from the pen of a French barrister, M. Auguste Nicolas, one of the most philosophic and able expositions and defences of the solemn and awful dogma of eternal loss. But the tone of his treatment is very unlike that of earlier defenders, say of Lessius. He begins in what may almost be called an apologetic tone—apologetic, we mean, in the modern sense of the word; and he would evidently be able to enter into the meaning of Cardinal Newman's language when he says:—

'From this time [1816] I have given a full inward assent and belief to the doctrine of eternal punishment, as delivered by our Lord Himself, in as true a sense as I hold that of eternal happiness; though I have tried in various ways to make that truth less terrible to the reason.'<sup>2</sup>

For M. Nicolas feels compelled to declare that

'among the moderns this dogma has become the most insurmountable, I do not say to the reason of the unbeliever, but to the faith of the Christian; and it is not uncommon to find souls who could believe all the rest of Christianity, and who are held in check in the presence of this one article of faith alone.'<sup>3</sup>

It was no wonder; for French literature had for many years been persistently attacking it in prose and verse. Rousseau in the preceding century, and in our own Lamennais, Damiron, Reynaud, Victor Hugo, George Sand, and many more were among the assailants. Châteaubriand, Lamartine, Jules Simon, and others rejected it, though less avowedly. A writer, who shall be named presently, declares that 'the whole contemporary literature of France, so Christian in many respects, has this same tendency.'

Contemporaneously the French pulpit exhibited a change, not indeed in essence, but in mode of treatment. In the age

<sup>1</sup> *Saturday Review*, September 1886, p. 397. We have reason to believe that the article cited is from the pen of the lamented H. N. Oxenham. The critic seems to be partially quoting the book he is reviewing, Dr. Shedd on the *Doctrine of Endless Punishment* (London: Nisbet and Co., 1885).

<sup>2</sup> *Apologia pro Vitâ suâ*, p. 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Études Philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, 2nde partie, chap. viii. tome ii. pp. 470-1. (Our own copy, the 7th edition, is of 1851. Paris: Vaton.)

of Louis XIV., and during the regency of the Duke of Orleans, preachers assumed what looks like the *primâ facie* assertion of Scripture (though we by no means assert that the *primâ facie* view is always and necessarily the correct one), namely, the fewness of the saved. Massillon, in a famous discourse, *Sur les Élus*, took this view as a matter of course. But it is characteristic of this nineteenth century, that we find the great Dominican orator Lacordaire, in the same city of Paris, and in the same Cathedral of Notre Dame, taking 'the opposite side to Massillon, and devoting one of his most eloquent sermons to prove that the city of tears will be almost a desert compared with the multitudes who will fill the other cities.'<sup>1</sup>

The change did not stop here. The Abbé Migne undertook to bring out (in A.D. 1850-60) an *Encyclopédie Théologique*, which for some 15*l.* should supply the French clergy with a survey of the whole of religious knowledge. The subject on which we are now engaged was intrusted to the Abbé le Noir. In the volume entitled *Dictionnaire des Harmonies de la Raison et de la Foi* (Paris, 1856) he devotes some columns to its treatment. Even M. Nicolas did not refrain from stating in a note 'le point le plus insaisissable du dogme de l'enfer et qui est comme le centre de son obscurité,' namely, the difficulty of reconciling it with the foreknowledge and the goodness of God, and of leaving it as a mystery by the side of that concerning our freedom and the Divine sovereignty; and Messrs. Arnold and Addis have with equal freedom left unanswered another difficulty which they proclaim.<sup>2</sup>

But M. le Noir (from whom we have borrowed our references to the French literature of the day, and the description of Lacordaire's sermon) goes much further than this. With M. Emery, M. de Pressy, and M. Carl, he maintains that '*it is reasonable to think that the condemned do not desire death, do*

<sup>1</sup> *Conférences de Notre-Dame*, tom. v. p. 135, &c.

<sup>2</sup> It is right to say that Father Clark, in the January to March numbers of the *Month* for 1882, has done his best, with great ability, to face these difficulties. (Dean Goulburn has done the same in his thoughtful and weighty Lectures on the same subject. London, 1875.) If we have understood aright the articles of F. Clark, and the conversation of two gifted and devoted members of the Roman Church, we should say that the discussions of the present century on this solemn theme had seriously modified the Roman theology in many quarters. F. Clark (in the March number of the *Month*, p. 307) classes with the Saints, whose filial happiness is secure, 'all who have made their act of submission [to God] and persevere in it.' Dr. Pusey's teaching was practically identical with this. But it needs some explanation, as M. Nicolas has shown, to reconcile it with the maxim *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.



not hate God, and do not curse Him,' restrictions which he asserts are not condemned by the Church. He argues that even if the views of Origen underwent condemnation by the fifth Œcumenical Council, *such a condemnation would not imply the formal definition, as an article of faith, of eternal punishment*, and that these infernal pains will not be eternal absolutely. He seems, moreover, to believe in 'the gradual improvement of the lost, though, like an asymptote, they may never actually reach the goodness of the blessed.'

Now we do not mean to sit in judgment upon M. le Noir, nor to discuss the lawfulness of his theories. What we are concerned with is this. Mr. Rivington declares that the English Church 'is wavering even on the subject of hell,' and *he leaves it for a communion in which, for these thirty years past, the above 'waverings' have been taught and published (we believe without the slightest rebuke) in what is put forward as a manual of orthodoxy.*<sup>1</sup> Such is the consistency of Rome's latest distinguished convert!

(3.) It remains to say something on the supposition that the mention of distinguished names is an argument which tells in one direction, and in one only. Let it be observed that it is on Mr. Rivington (p. 10), and not on us, that lies the responsibility for the introduction of this element into the case. Having resolved to adopt it, he naturally places first the one man of genius among Englishmen who submitted to Rome some forty-four years ago, and with that name he conjoins three others—those of Wilberforce, Manning, Coleridge—not indeed to be compared with John Henry Newman in intellectual power, but still men of weight and of high gifts, which must ever have made them ornaments of whatever communion they became members. It is undeniable, as he says, that he could have mentioned many more.

But the future ecclesiastical historian of our age will be compelled, if his work is to be anything better than a mere party pamphlet, to place on record two facts of very different character. Against the acceptance of the Roman claims during the period 1845-1889, he will notify the secession from Vaticanism of an eminent canonist like Schulte, against the genius of Newman he will place that of Ignatius von

<sup>1</sup> Our evidence is to be found in the *Dictionnaire* already named (pp. 1715-16), and from the companion volume, also by M. le Noir, *Dictionnaire des Droits de la Raison dans la Foi* (pp. 785, 819). All this was given more at length in the *Christian Remembrancer* for October 1864, art. 'Voices from Rome—Dr. Manning;' but it is not a case of plagiarism, nor was that article, to our knowledge, ever answered.

De  
of, t  
into  
and  
cer  
No  
con  
Gib  
oth  
who  
teen  
Jan  
in C  
spe  
resi  
dur  
som  
ther  
to t  
bec  
Ffo  
star  
prie  
Ora  
one  
of c  
how  
men  
case  
Chu  
and  
of t  
The  
som  
topi  
one  
Bot

verts  
contr  
that,  
has n  
she n  
point  
1888  
perus

Döllinger as that of a recalcitrant from the latest usurpations of the Roman see: a man fully Newman's equal in all purely intellectual gifts, his superior in judicial clearness of outlook, and perhaps more than his superior in all the learning concerned with the history and claims of the Church of Rome. Nor is this all. He will remember how of three brilliant converts to Rome of an earlier date—Chillingworth, Boyle, Gibbon—one returned to the Anglican Church, while the other two became hopeless sceptics. He will ask himself whether this phenomenon has not been repeated in the nineteenth century. And, even apart from the revival of the Jansenist Church in Holland, and the Alt-Katholik movement in Germany, he will find that in England it is impossible to specify any body of men of which so large a percentage has resiled as that of those who have become Roman Catholics during the period of which we are now speaking. With sorrow our historian will notice that the divisions among them resemble that of the three above named, some returning to the fold of the Mother whom they had abandoned, the rest becoming more or less rationalistic sceptics. The names of Ffoulkes, Jephson, Hemans, Case, Renouf, Hutton, are instances in point. We say nothing of three other Roman priests who, during the last few years, have left the London Oratory. Their ecclesiastical position is, we believe, a dubious one, but the fact that some of them have broken their vows of celibacy might seem to complicate the question. It is, however, idle to pretend that those whom we have named are men of insignificant mental stature. The very reverse is the case. Mr. Ffoulkes has wrought loyally for the English Church since his return, and is a man of exceptional ability and wide learning. Mr. Renouf was, humanly speaking, sure of the highest honours at Oxford at the time he left us. The others are (or were) all of them men of distinction in some way.<sup>1</sup> One of them, about 1850, held converse on these topics with an intimate friend. They were unable to agree; one remained loyal to England, the other bowed to Rome. Both lived some thirty years after their sad parting. But

<sup>1</sup> In this connexion we cannot but be struck with the paucity of converts of any real mark during the last twenty-five or thirty years, as contrasted with the distinction of the earlier seceders, and as showing that, even with the powerful aid of these seceders, the Roman Church has not been able to secure any notable success in proselytism, if, indeed, she manages to hold her own. The subject has been discussed from this point of view in a striking article in the *Quarterly Review* for January 1888, entitled 'Roman Catholics in England,' which will amply repay perusal.

how different was the end ! The Roman Catholic found that the Vatican Council proved to him as great a difficulty as had in earlier days been the decision in the Gorham case. He died in a hesitating frame of mind, and left all his fortune to a sceptical body, the Hibbert Trustees. The other, if his flock was small, was deeply honoured, not only by that flock but by a large circle of co-religionists in many homes, and by numbers outside the pale of the communion which he adorned. At his decease might well have been uttered the words of the Roman matron of old—

‘Maternis laudor lacrymis, urbisque querelis,’<sup>1</sup>

only that the mother was not, like Cornelia’s, an earthly matron, but ‘Jerusalem, which is the Mother of us all.’

We have no pleasure in recording these contrasts. The home of any Christian communion is, in our eyes, superior to the dreary, barren waste of scepticism. But they *are* facts, and they are surely warnings. Roman Catholics must, we presume, maintain that it would have been far better for those to whom we have referred never to have submitted to Rome. When we look at Mr. Rivington’s strange theories about the *à priori* necessity of a purely human head to the Church ; at his reticence about the discrepancies between Cardinal Manning and Mr. Mivart concerning Holy Scripture ; at his seeming ignorance of the licence allowed by Rome on questions of eschatology ; at his keen sense of *our* evils, and his apparently idealized picture of the communion which he has joined, we dread, we must own, the possibility of some future shock to his convictions which might hereafter lead him to follow the steps of a Hutton and others. Better certainly, as we have implied, even the adherence to ultramontane Christianity than that.

But for others still with us, the erratic course of men of such attainments is, we repeat, a solemn warning. ‘*Spartam nactus es ; hanc exorna !*’ is a *dictum* that involves more than merely patriotic aspirations.

‘God chooses for thee : seal His choice,  
Nor from thy Mother’s shadow stray ;  
For sure thine holy Mother’s shade  
Rests yet upon thine ancient home ;  
No voice from Heaven hath clearly said,  
“Let us depart ;” then fear to roam.’<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Propertius, lib. iv., Elegia xi., lin. 57 (Defuncta Cornelia Paulum alloquitur).

<sup>2</sup> Keble, *Lyra Innocentium*.

## ART. VI.—THE QUIGNON BREVIARY.

*Breviarium Romanum a Francisco Cardinali Quignonio editum et recognitum, iuxta editionem Venetiis A.D. 1535 impressam curante JOHANNE WICKHAM LEGG, Societatis Antiquariorum atque Collegii Regalis Medicorum Londinensium Socio, in Nosocomio Sancti Bartholomæi olim Prælectore. (Cantabrigiæ, typis atque impensis Academiæ, 1888.)*

THE Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, whatever opinion may be held of its liturgical merits, will always keep a place of lasting importance in the history of Liturgy. And to English Churchmen its interest is increased fourfold by the influence which it had on the development of the Mattins and Evensong of the Book of Common Prayer, an influence which may be overrated or underrated, but which unquestionably exists. In the opinion of a liturgical scholar like Dr. Neale

‘It is more than the basis of the English Prayer Book. Were we to class all offices into families Quignon’s would not stand with the Breviary, but would take its place with our own service, and, therefore, it is of the greatest importance that we should be thoroughly acquainted with the Spanish ecclesiastic’s reform, in order that we may thoroughly appreciate our own.’<sup>1</sup>

It is important, in the first place, to understand that there are two texts or recensions of Cardinal Quignon’s Breviary, and that these two texts differ from one another in their construction and details. The first text is that which has now been reprinted by the Cambridge University Press. It appeared in at least eight editions during the years 1535 and 1536. The second text was much longer lived, and appeared in numerous editions between 1536 and 1566. Both appeared with a brief from Paul III., allowing the recitation of the offices contained in them in place of the old Roman Breviary, and they thus possess whatever authority may be given by a papal letter.

The first text represents the utmost limit attained by the party of reform within the Church of Rome. It had become plain that some reform of the Breviary must be undertaken.

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 1856, vol. xvii. p. 49. Mr. Beresford Hope pointed out to us shortly before his death that H. S. L. are the second consonants of JoHn MaSon NeaLe.

The results of the Franciscan Reform at the end of the thirteenth century had at last become intolerable. Rudolf of Tongern tells us that the Franciscan friars had succeeded in turning the Liturgy of the Church of Rome into the Liturgy of a clique; that in his time the calendar was already overburdened with Franciscan and local Roman saints that were not Gregorian; and that in consequence the ferial Psalms and offices were rarely, and Holy Scripture never, read ('sacram scripturam omnimode in officio negligunt').<sup>1</sup> Thus a few of the same Psalms were said over and over again as the proper Psalms of Saints' days, instead of the whole of the Psalter being gone through once a week; and in like manner as soon as one book of the Bible was begun it was interrupted by the occurrence of the legends of the saints.

To this pass had the Franciscan system arrived at the end of the fourteenth century when Rudolf wrote; but the state of affairs had grown so much worse in Leo X.'s time that a reform of the Breviary was determined upon by those in authority at Rome. This revision was, in the first place, entrusted to Ferreri, the title-page of whose *Hymni Novi Ecclesiastici* contains an announcement of a new Breviary, 'Breviarium Ecclesiasticum ab eodem Zach. Pont. longe brevius et facilius redditum, et ab omni errore purgatum propediem exhibit.' But the death of the author almost before the book of hymns was published hindered effectually the fulfilment of the promise of the new Breviary. Then came the sack of Rome and the imprisonment of Clement VII. in the castle of St. Angelo. Now Quignon's connexion with the reform of the Breviary is very likely due to this imprisonment. He was confessor to Charles V., and was employed by the emperor in negotiating with Clement VII. the terms of enlargement. In this office he gave such satisfaction to the Pope that he was made cardinal priest of the Sessorian Basilica (*Santa Croce in Gerusalemme*), and was also entrusted with the reform of the Breviary. Others, however, besides Ferreri and Quignon, had been thought of by Clement VII. for this liturgical work. He had given in 1529 a commission<sup>2</sup> to John Peter Carafa, Bishop of Theate (the modern Chieti), afterwards Paul IV., and the members of the new congregation, called Theatines, to revise the Missal, the Breviary, and the office of the B.V.M. They seem to have completed this revision,

<sup>1</sup> Radulphi decani Tungrensis *De Canonum Observantia* prop. xxii., apud Hittorp (*De Divinis Eccles. Officiis*).

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Silos, *Historiarum Clericorum Regularium*, pars prior, lib. iii. p. 95. (Romæ, 1650.) The text of the brief is given.

though no record of it is now known to exist, and it is said to have been done in a more conservative fashion than that which Quignon chose. They, however, expunged the apocryphal histories, and refused to allow lessons from Origen and Eusebius, or any authors suspected of heresy; now Quignon borrows freely in his legends of the saints from Eusebius. They also simplified the rubrics. For some reason or other, perhaps the unstable character of the Pope, their labours did not meet with approval, and it may be noticed that Paul IV. was the first of the Popes who refused to issue licenses to ecclesiastics to recite the Breviary of Quignon.

Thus was the Spanish Quignon, general of the Franciscans in the sixteenth century, appointed to review the work of the English Haymo, General of the Franciscans in the thirteenth century. In the preface to the Breviary, Quignon tells us that he was helped by certain of his chaplains, learned men. But he does not give their names. Diego a Neyla, later on a canon of Salamanca, is said by Genesius Sepulveda<sup>1</sup> to have been the chief worker, helped, it is said, by Sepulveda himself, and one Gaspar de Castro. It would thus seem that this revision of the Breviary was altogether a Spanish undertaking, and its Spanish origin is seen in the Spanish saints who had not before been admitted into the Roman calendar.

Before the new Breviary could be published, Clement VII. died, and a new Pope, Paul III., was elected in October 1534. He continued his predecessor's support to Quignon, for the brief allowing the recitation of the new Breviary is dated February 5, 1535. It is addressed to the printers, and allows all secular clerks and priests to recite Quignon's Breviary in place of the old, provided a special license were had from the Apostolic See, which should be granted by the Court of *Segnatura*, and without fee.

At first the licence to recite this Breviary was granted only from Rome. Later on, leave was given by papal legates and nuncios. Last of all, there were some bulls and Papal indulgences containing clauses allowing whosoever would to use the new Breviary.<sup>2</sup> St. Francis Xavier was granted this permission on account of his multifarious occupations; yet his biographer relates with pride that he continued to the end

<sup>1</sup> Jo. Genesii Sepulvedæ Cordubensis *Epistolarum Libri Septem* (Sal-mantica, 1557), Epist. ciii.

<sup>2</sup> 'Initio Romam mittebant pro literis Pontificiis, ut hæc sibi licerent; mox per legatos et nuncios apostolicos ceptum est dispensari, extremo loco ad Bullas et indulgentias Pontificias res delata est. Quorum una est clausula, ut vocant, quod possit quis tali novo Breviario uti' (MS. Vatican Library, *Cod. Vatic.* 4878, cap. xi. fol. 22 recto).



to recite the old and longer office.<sup>1</sup> But he could have had no very great objection to the book, for in a letter to St. Ignatius Loyola he asks for a license to recite this new Breviary, which he might at pleasure give to six clerks as a sort of inducement to them to go with him into the Indies.<sup>2</sup> The shortness and simplicity of this first text made it at once extremely popular, of which the best evidence is the number of editions that it very soon ran through. Between the February of 1535 and the July of 1536 there appeared at least eight editions, two probably at Rome, one at Venice, one at Lyons, three or more at Paris, one at Antwerp. The variations of four of these editions are represented in the Cambridge reprint.

But it was not well received everywhere. On the 27th of the July following the publication of the first edition, the doctors of the Sorbonne met, and they heard the reasons why the new Breviary should not be accepted; they approved of these reasons, and agreed that they should be sent to the Pope 'cum omni humilitate et modestia.'<sup>3</sup> Their reasons for rejecting the new Breviary were chiefly these: it was unlike any other Breviary; it contained no office of the B.V.M., no antiphons, responds, little chapters, nor homilies; and the distribution of the Psalter and of Holy Scripture was new. This remonstrance seems to have caused the Pope and Quignon to prepare without delay another recension, with which they made such good speed that the brief allowing the second text is dated just a twelvemonth afterwards, in the July of the following year, 1536.

In the preface to this second text, Quignon sets out by saying that the first text had been accepted and approved by many learned men, but yet it was not the promulgation of a law, rather a sort of public deliberation. Of this recension the Sorbonne seems to have taken no notice for a time; but in 1552 it had approved of this second text,<sup>4</sup> and again, it is said, indirectly in 1574, a few years after its use had been abolished by Pius V.<sup>5</sup>

This second text is the one best known to liturgical

<sup>1</sup> Orazio Torsellino, *De Vita B. Francisci Xaverii*, Colon. Agripp. 1621, lib. vi. cap. v. p. 520.

<sup>2</sup> Petrus Possinus, *S. Francisci Xaveri . . . Epistolarum Libri Septem*, Romæ, 1667, lib. i. Ep. vi. p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Caroli Duplessi d'Argentré *Collectio Judiciorum*, Lut. Paris. 1728, t. ii. p. 121. The reasons are on pp. 122-126.

<sup>4</sup> Some editions printed at Lyons by Thibaud Payen bear a license, dated March 4, 1552, from 'Matthieu Ory, Docteur en Théologie et Inquisiteur Général de la foi, avec aussi l'approbation de la Sorbone.'

<sup>5</sup> Richard Simon, *Lettres choisies*, Amsterdam, 1700, p. 187, Lettre xxv.

scholars, and was reprinted a very great number of times. Dr. Neale speaks of seventeen editions, Guéranger of thirty; but double this number can be collected without very great trouble by anyone who will search the libraries even as he journeys from London to Rome. The last seem to have been printed in 1566, but even this year brought forth four editions, two at Paris, one at Antwerp, and one at Pesaro. This last is noteworthy from its form. As a rule a Quignon is a *totum*, but this Pisauran edition is in two parts, a *pars hyemalis* and a *pars æstivalis*. The title-page is dated 1564, the colophon 1566. We have seen two or three other editions in two parts, but we have yet to meet with an edition in four parts, a form Azevedo declares to be common.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Blew (whose library contains all liturgical curiosities) has a most rare Quignonian *Diurnale*, that is, a book of lauds and day hours without Mattins, in 16mo., printed at Venice by Junta about 1542.

To John de Arze, a professor of theology and priest at Palencia, in Spain, we owe an important part of our knowledge of the history of Quignon's Breviary. He drew up a memorandum which was presented to the Council of Trent in August 1551, and which has been preserved in the Vatican Library (*Cod. Vatican.* 4878; also a duplicate, 5302, but less clearly written). It has this title, *De novo Breviario tollendo Consultatio*.<sup>2</sup> It is a vigorous attack upon the new Breviary, but it gives also abundance of information as to its progress in Spain. In that country its use spread widely. The name of Roman Breviary encouraged the clergy to recite it in choir, in public, and in private. Several dioceses in Spain adopted Quignon—as Saragossa, Palencia, and Taragona, and others, even when the bishop was unwilling. The clergy of these dioceses were broken up into three, or even four, parties: some reciting Quignon, others the new diocesan Breviary, others the old diocesan Breviary, while the remainder betook themselves to the old Roman Breviary. 'Qui omnes inter se sæpe dissident, rixantur, mutuo convitiantur, pugnis interdum nedum convitiis decertant: et ex ecclesiastica concordia fit cruenta pugna, intra ecclesiæ septa, chorique cancellos, pastorum ecclesiasticis id spectantibus.' In Holy Week things would seem to have come to a crisis. The faithful were

<sup>1</sup> Emmanuel de Azevedo, *Exercitationes Liturgicæ*, Romæ, 1750, p. 35, Exercit. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Faustinus Arevalus has printed some parts of this important MS. in his *Hymnodia Hispanica* (Romæ, 1786, p. 423). A learned friend tells us that it has been printed by Roskóvany, *Calibatus et Breviarium*, Pestini, 1861, t. v. p. 635.

shocked at the disappearance of the *Tenebræ* service, and, shaking off the dust of their feet against the clergy, betook themselves to the monks. Arze further tells us that the Hieronymites and Franciscan friars had taken to Quignon; the latter were forbidden its use in a general assembly on the authority of Michel Antonius. Even some ancient monasteries are said to have adopted the new Breviary. A very learned and accurate writer in the *Tablet* of May 12, 1888, tells us that Quignon found its way into an ancient monastery like St. Bertin's.

Was the Quignonian Breviary adopted in whole, or were only its lessons taken over? At Orleans, for example, the Breviary published in 1542 shows many marks of Quignon's influence, but it is not wholly Quignon. The distribution of the Psalter is Gregorian, and there are antiphons and responds. But several of the lessons are direct from Quignon, as the lessons for St. Thomas the Apostle, St. Thomas of Canterbury, St. Sylvester, and St. Prisca. The preface on the verso of the title-page quotes from Quignon; it announces that there has been cut off 'quod piorum ac doctorum aures offendere poterat.' In like manner, the monks at Milan, called the *Humiliati*, adopted, with licence of Paul III., in 1548 an entirely new Breviary.<sup>1</sup> The old Benedictine distribution was broken up, and a new-fangled Psalter, based upon the month, not the week, devised. The histories of the Saints were, in many instances, taken word for word from the second text of Quignon; and the same taking over of the *legenda* may be seen in some of the old Roman Breviaries printed at Venice by Junta after 1560, where it is openly said that the lessons come from the Breviary of Paul III. In all these it may be noticed that it was not the main feature of a Breviary—the distribution of the Psalter—that was adopted, but a secondary character, a detail, the history or *legenda* of the Saints. In the other breviaries, at present unknown to us, in which Quignon is said to have been adopted, it is possible that, as in these, only the lessons have been borrowed and not the whole of the Breviary. On the other hand, the fact asserted by Arze that there were no Holy Week *Tenebræ* in the new Spanish Breviaries certainly points to an adoption of the Quignonian distribution of the Psalter.

<sup>1</sup> Prefixed to the editions of 1548 and 1751. This latter is only for the use of the *moniales*. It seems possible that, if Quignon had held its ground, this *Breviarium Humiliatorum* might have been put forward as the pattern of a reformed Breviary for regulars, just as Quignon might have been held out as a pattern to seculars.

the  
ins  
an  
Ps  
no  
Qu  
les

any  
Br  
int  
all  
ref  
156  
Qu  
aft  
hov  
cou  
den  
as  
tha  
war  
Col  
bee  
har  
two  
the  
are

con  
read  
onc  
time  
thes  
geth

1  
ques  
2  
1672  
3  
juin,  
likely  
the f  
elude  
Roya

The objections to Quignon, which have been urged from the time of Dominico Soto to the present, are shortly these : instead of allowing us to recite a few well-known Psalms over and over again, Quignon compels us to go over the whole Psalter once a week ; so that the Breviary becomes a study, not a prayer. Further, the responds to the lessons which Quignon abolished were great aids to prayer, while Quignon's lessons as they stand are mere exercises of the intellect.

In the acts of the Council of Trent there does not appear any record that the Fathers distinctly condemned Quignon's Breviary. Dominico Soto says they heard of its extension into churches in Spain 'non sine mœrore et scandalo.'<sup>1</sup> At all events, Paul IV., three years after his election in 1555, refused any further licenses for its recitation ; and finally, in 1568, Pius V.; by the bull *Quod a nobis*, abolished the use of Quignon altogether. Doubtless this was a great blow, for after this date we find no more editions printed. Its use, however, must have persisted in some dioceses, for provincial councils, held after the publication of the bull of Pius V., condemn its use. Such a one may be met with at Rouen as late as 1581.<sup>2</sup> A writer in the *Journal des Sçavans* has asserted that Quignon was reprinted in 1596, but the proof of this is wanting.<sup>3</sup> It is often said that the Breviary devised by Colbert, Louis XIV.'s great minister, and which may have been printed about 1679, was a reprint of Quignon. It is hard to believe that those who say this can ever have had the two books together in their hands, and still harder to explain the assertion that the French Breviaries of the last century are identical with that of Quignon.

From very early times the Divine service in the West has consisted mainly of the recitation of the Psalms and the reading of the Holy Scriptures. The Psalter was read through once a week, the chief part of the Bible once a year. By the time that the Reformation had begun, we have seen that these two practices had become much obscured, if not altogether lost, and the revision carried out by Quignon aimed at

<sup>1</sup> Dominicus Soto, *De Iustitia et Jure*, Antverpiæ, 1567, lib. x. art. 4, quæst. v. p. 338 verso.

<sup>2</sup> Ph. Labbé and Gabr. Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, Lut. Paris. 1672, t. xv. p. 824.

<sup>3</sup> Hyppolite Helyot, *Supplément du Journal des Sçavans* du dernier juin, 1708, p. 230. He repeats this statement on p. 235, so that it is not likely to be a printer's error for 1566. He also speaks of an edition of the first text printed by Julian Lunel in 1535, 8vo., which has hitherto eluded observation. It was in the library of the Minimes of the Place Royale.

bringing back both. If we look over his Breviary we see that it may easily be divided—indeed, he tells us as much in his preface (p. xxi)—into three parts: the Psalter, the *Dominicale*, which contains the first, second, and third lessons taken from the Old and New Testament, and the *Sanctorale*, which contains the third lessons for Saints' Days, many of which are from ecclesiastical writers. Imbedded in the *Dominicale* and *Sanctorale* are a number of collects and hymns, all taken from the old Breviary; and it may be well to observe here that there is but little in this reformed Breviary that is new. Quignon has merely distributed old material, without much taste or judgment. Even in the new histories of the Saints, the part which Quignon and his chaplains put together specially for the work, the matter has been taken over without any great amount of winnowing; Platina, for instance, being often followed word for word, even where his historical statements have been much doubted; and the choice of the authors laid under contribution has not been always judicious or admirable from an orthodox or critical point of view. Some, too, of the finest hymns in the old Breviary have been sacrificed, in order that only the Sunday hymn *Nocte surgentes* may be said at Mattins every day in the week. The loss of liturgical beauty caused by the destruction of antiphons, chapters, and responds will also be understood by anyone moderately acquainted with the old Breviary, though it was the price that had to be paid for the simplification of the Divine service, a price, however, not thought too great by Cardinal Thomasius, one of the greatest liturgical scholars that the Church of Rome has produced.<sup>1</sup> In his scheme for reform, liturgical forms were altogether abolished, and there was nothing left but the Psalms and chapters from the Bible.

To begin with the Psalter. The redistribution of this was no doubt one of the most daring acts of Quignon's revision. Yet some rearrangement of the Gregorian Psalter has always been felt necessary by those whose endeavour has been to secure the recitation of all the Psalms during the week. This may be seen in the French revisions of the Breviary at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. It was thought that it was impossible to retain the *Beati immaculati* as the daily Psalm for Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, if the Psalter were to be recited once a week. Further, the Gregorian followed the Hebrew arrangement of

<sup>1</sup> See the tract *De Privato Ecclesiasticorum Officiorum Breviario extra Chorum*, in Vezzosi's edition of the Cardinal's works (*Opera omnia*, Romæ, 1754, t. vii. p. 62).

the Psalms ; for, roughly speaking and with large exceptions, the Psalms before *Dixit Dominus* (cx.) were given to Mattins, and those after, to Vespers, and they were recited in the order in which they stand in the Bible.<sup>1</sup> Eighteen Psalms were said at Mattins on Sundays, twelve on weekdays, and nine on festivals. Quignon gave up this, and, choosing the Psalms mainly according to their length, arranged them in threes, so that three Psalms should be recited at each of the canonical hours, the shorter ones at the Little Hours, Vespers, and Compline, and the longer ones at Mattins ; at Lauds two Psalms and the canticle for the day from the old Breviary were said. In justification of this great change it may be said that there are precedents for three Psalms only at Mattins, followed by three lessons, of which the best known are the Mattins of the Roman Breviary during Easter and Whitsun weeks, and in the national rites during the whole Paschal season—precedents which come down from the antiquity to which it was Quignon's desire to return. At Mattins the number of verses in the three Psalms averages 100, varying from 80 on Monday to 117 on Thursday. On Sunday the Psalms are taken from the Gregorian distribution for the more part, though diminished of course in number. On the other days of the week an attempt has been made to keep for Mattins and Vespers some of the old Psalms, an attempt which is most apparent in the Vespers of Friday and Saturday. The Psalm *Deus, Deus meus* (xxii.) is said at Mattins on Friday, and the Psalms generally on that day seem to have been chosen for their foreshadowing of the Passion ; but it does not seem that much heed has been taken of the Betrayal on Wednesday or of the Eucharist on Thursday.

It should be noted that there are no proper Psalms, and it has been made a reproach to this Breviary that if Christmas Day fall on a Wednesday or a Friday the same Psalms are to be recited as on Ash Wednesday or Good Friday. And the same Psalms are said on fast days like Maundy Thursday, and great festivals like Holy Thursday and Corpus Christi.

The Canticles at Lauds preserve their old order in the week ; and the Gospel Canticles are said at the same Hours as in the old Breviary. The *Te Deum* is directed to be said every day after the third lesson at Mattins, weekdays as well as festivals, except in Advent and Lent. The special festal character of the *Te Deum* is thus lost. It is to be said if a

<sup>1</sup> Thomasius retained the Gregorian distribution in his scheme for a working Breviary, and proper Psalms were only allowed at Christmas, Easter, and such-like days.



Saint's day should be kept in Advent or Lent. The Athanasian Creed is recited at Prime on Sundays. In the rubric of the Second Text it is directed to be said every Sunday, even if the Sunday be a feast day or in an octave.

In the Psalter of the First Text it may be noticed that there are absolutely no antiphons to the Psalms or Canticles throughout the book. This was one of the objections raised by the Sorbonne. Accordingly, in the Psalter of the Second Text we find antiphons to the Psalms of the Little Hours, and all three Psalms were to be said under this one antiphon. The antiphons are short, usually from a verse of one of the three Psalms that are to follow; but Quignon does not seem to have followed the old Breviary in choosing these. At Mattins, Lauds, and Vespers the Psalms and Canticles are all said together under one antiphon, which is usually borrowed from some corresponding part of the old service. At Compline the Psalms and *Nunc dimittis* are all said together under *Salva nos*, the old antiphon for *Nunc dimittis*, the hymn *Te lucis ante terminum* being said at the beginning of Compline. It may be convenient to remark here that the hymns in Quignon, whether in the First or the Second Text, are all said at the beginning of the Canonical Hour, as they were in the old Breviary at the Little Hours.

The distribution of the Psalter appears to be the same in all the editions of Quignon, whether they be of the First or of the Second Text. Several of the Antwerp editions after 1560 have arguments to the Psalms taken from Ludolf the Carthusian.

As the Psalter contains the Psalms arranged for the week, so the *Dominicale* contains the first, second, and many of the third lessons arranged for the year. The old Breviary contained lessons which varied in number according to the day: on Sundays and festivals nine, on weekdays and in the Paschal season three. True to his scheme of making the service for all days alike, Quignon reduced the lessons for any day in the year to three in number, making, however, each lesson about equal in length to the three contained in each nocturn according to the old Breviary: the first and second nocturn of which contained each three lessons, usually taken from the Old or New Testament, or from the life of the Saint commemorated on that day; the third nocturn three lessons from the writings of the Fathers. In the First Text, Quignon arranged his lessons on the following plan: the first lesson from the Old Testament, the second from the New Testament, the third from the Epistles or the Acts, except on a Saint's day, when the

less  
the  
less  
im  
fou  
in  
spe  
On  
the  
"we  
Sep  
wit  
and  
fir  
in  
fir  
by  
at  
Jos  
san  
fall  
less  
and  
me  
or  
tiv  
we  
Ea  
gre  
old  
exc

the  
we  
Ge  
beg  
aft  
ven  
fall

tho  
evic  
Do  
sion  
Ger

lesson was to be found in the *Sanctorale*. In the First Text the *Dominicale* contained all the first, second, and third lessons for every day in the year except Saints' days and the immovable festivals, the third lessons for which were to be found in the *Sanctorale*. The first lessons begin with Isaiah in Advent, and this book is read daily for seven weeks, no special provision being made for Christmas and the Epiphany. On these great festivals are read the lessons for the day of the week in which they chance to fall, the first or second 'week after Advent.' The first lessons begin again in Septuagesima with Genesis, and continue with this book without a break all through Lent, including Ash Wednesday and Holy Week up to Easter Day. On Good Friday the first lesson sets forth the embalming of Jacob and his burial in Canaan, as a meditation suitable for the day. Indeed, the first lessons of Holy Week seem to have been determined by a desire to finish Genesis, so that Exodus might be begun at Easter, and the doings of the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph read as an edifying first lesson on Easter Day. The same mechanical recitation of the portion that happens to fall to the day may be noticed in the first and second lessons for Ascension Day, Whitsunday, Trinity Sunday, and Corpus Christi. These feasts have assigned to them merely the chapter from Exodus or Deuteronomy, Corinthians or the Acts, that happens to be in reading. There are positively no proper first and second lessons in the First Text, if we except the second lessons for Passiontide and for the Easter Week itself. It may be that Quignon has seen so great an abuse of proper Psalms and proper lessons in the old system that in his revision the pendulum swung back, excusably perhaps, to the other extreme.

But Quignon did not throw away every shred of tradition in the arrangement of the new Lectionary. The old Breviary, as we all know, began the Book of Isaiah in Advent, and that of Genesis in Septuagesima. Accordingly, in Quignon, Isaiah is begun with Advent, and continued till the end of the third week after the fourth Sunday in Advent, Quignon's weeks *post Adventum*.<sup>1</sup> In the *Dominicæ vagantes* the five weeks, which may fall, whole or in part, after the Epiphany or before Advent,

<sup>1</sup> The *Sundays after Advent* and the *Dominicæ vagantes* have been thought inventions of Quignon's own. We understand, however, that evidence has lately been found of an earlier origin. Colbert adopts the *Dominicæ vagantes* in his arrangement of the year. With this expression we may compare the 'odde wandring dayes' of Edmund Spenser.—General Argument of *The Shepheurdes Calender*, Globe ed. 1869, p. 445.

Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the lesser Prophets are read, but only in part. From Septuagesima to Easter Even, Genesis; from Easter Day to Whitsun Eve, Exodus to end of chap. xxxiv.; from Whitsunday to the Saturday before the ninth Sunday after Pentecost, Deuteronomy are read without break. Joshua and the First Book of Samuel, with two chapters from the Second, a few chapters from Proverbs, Daniel, and Job, fill up the rest of the ferial season. The points wherein Quignon has followed the old Breviary in the distribution of the first lessons, are the retention of Isaiah in Advent, the beginning of Genesis at Septuagesima, and the reading of the Kings after Trinity; in the third lessons the Pauline Epistles are begun directly after the Epiphany; and at the end of May the Epistles of SS. John, James, and Jude are read. In the old Breviary these Epistles were read before the Ascension. In the Second Text, however, there are no unoccupied days in January, and only a few chapters from SS. James and John are read in May and the beginning of June.

In the Second Text many changes were introduced into the Lectionary of the First. Portions of Isaiah were read up to the Thursday after the Third Sunday in Advent, and then followed a chapter or two out of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and a few of the minor prophets, including Baruch, up to the end of the Fourth Week. Proper lessons, both for Christmas and Epiphany, are provided in the Second Text, as well as for Ash Wednesday, Passiontide, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, Trinity Sunday, and Corpus Christi. A few chapters from Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Wisdom are read in the three 'weeks after Advent,' and sixteen chapters of Ecclesiasticus during the 'Vagantes.' Genesis is read from Septuagesima to the Octave of Corpus Christi, with interruptions at Passiontide. After this day Exodus is read until the eve of the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost. Then parts of the Kings are read up to the Tuesday after the Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost; and during the rest of the Christian year chapters from Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Esther, and Job.

The second lessons appear to be the same in both Texts. The Gospel of St. Luke begins with Advent, and runs without break to the end of the twenty-first chapter at the end of the 'Third Week after Advent.' The Epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, are read during the 'Vagantes.' With Septuagesima begins the Gospel of St. John, which continues to the Saturday before the Third Sunday in Lent, ending with the twenty-sixth chapter. Then are read the Epistles of St. John and St. James,

ending  
up with  
Gospel  
tion.  
passing  
sun Ev  
Epistol  
end of  
to the  
teenth  
ending

In  
Script  
The fi  
tures,  
Books  
Acts, c  
a less  
other  
Sunda  
third l  
fasts, v  
read.  
for Ho  
immo  
Candle  
Holy  
St. Joh  
other S  
many

In  
Holy  
may n  
third l  
Sorb  
old Br  
Third  
in the C  
besides  
days w  
Lent, h

The  
are not  
the In  
ference

ending on the eve of Passion Sunday. Passiontide is taken up with the account of the Passion according to the four Gospels, and Easter Week with the Gospels of the Resurrection. On Low Sunday the Epistle to the Romans begins, passing into the first to the Corinthians, which ends on Whitsun Eve. At Pentecost the Acts begin, followed by the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the Gospel of St. Matthew to the end of chapter xxv., the Epistles of St. Jude, to the Hebrews, to the Philippians, the Gospel of Mark to the end of the thirteenth chapter, the Epistles to the Colossians and of St. Peter, ending with two chapters from the Revelation.

In the First Text the idea that nothing but the Holy Scriptures should be read in the lessons is seen at its highest. The first and second lessons are all from the Holy Scriptures, not even admitting selections from the Deuterocanonical Books. The third lessons are all from the Epistles and the Acts, except on Saints' days, when Quignon as a rule gives a lesson taken from Platina, Eusebius, St. Jerome, or some other ecclesiastical writer; and on Easter Day and Trinity Sunday, when he has recourse to the old Breviary for the third lesson. And there are even third lessons for festivals or fasts, which still increase the amount of the Holy Scriptures read. The third lessons for the last three days of Holy Week, for Holy Thursday, Whitsunday, Corpus Christi, and many immovable feasts, such as Christmas Day, the Epiphany, Candlemas, the Visitation, and All Saints, are selections from Holy Scripture, while the third lesson for the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, the Conversion of St. Paul, and several other Saints, are based upon the Gospel narrative, and contain many sentences in the very words of the Scripture itself.

In the lessons of the Second Text the amount of the Holy Scriptures was much less. Among the first lessons may now be found readings from the Apocrypha, and in the third lessons (perhaps in deference to the complaints of the Sorbonne) Quignon has returned in so many instances to the old Breviary system of reading a homily from a Father in the Third Nocturn that the third lessons from the Epistles set in the Calendar can have been but seldom read. For instance, besides the Saints' days, in the Second Text all Sundays, all days within Octaves, and the week-days in Advent and Lent, have readings from the Fathers as third lessons.

The sources of the third lessons for Saints' days which are not taken from the Bible, are to some extent indicated in the Index on p. 203 of the Cambridge edition. The differences between the Saints'-day lessons in the First and

Second Texts vary from an entire rewriting to a few verbal changes for improvement of style. The lessons for Hilary (Jan. 31), Urban (May 25), and Zephirinus (Aug. 26), are almost rewritten. In some of the lessons of the Second Text a tendency is shown to assert the miraculous where the First Text had left the matter open. In the lesson for St. Francis<sup>1</sup> (Oct. 3) it is said of the seraph with the stigmata in the First Text *apparuisse memoratur*; in the Second Text, *apparuit*; so of the burial of St. Catherine by angels (Nov. 25) the First Text reads *conditum esse traditur*; the second, *conditum est*. But the tendency of the Second Text has not always been in this direction. Where the honour of St. James, the patron of Spain, was concerned, it might have been thought that not a jot of the claims made for him by his clients would be abated; yet in the Second Text the details of the early journey into Spain are omitted; and it is only said that Isidore has asserted that he made a journey thither. And the quasi-miraculous climbing of the Temple stairs at the Presentation of the B.V.M. (Nov. 21) has been left out of the Second Text.

In the First Text the lesson for the Conception of the B.V.M. is said to be taken from the sermons of St. Augustine. In the Second it has been taken from the office 'Sicut lilium,' composed by Leonard Nogarol, a lesson made up of short texts from certain of the Fathers, including St. Dominic and St. Thomas. Quignon has merely transcribed this lesson into his Second Text. For this he has been called 'homo impudentissimus,' because the lesson attributes to St. Thomas a belief in the Immaculate Conception. It has been said that the lesson only appears after the death of Quignon in 1540; but this is not the case. It is found in all that we have examined of the editions of the Second Text before 1540; but Quignon is hardly to be called 'homo impudentissimus' for adopting a lesson which he found beforehand in the old Breviary.

The Saints in the Calendar are nearly all from times before the eighth century. SS. Bonaventure, Bernard, Clara, Dominic, Francis of Assisi, Thomas of Aquinum, and Thomas of Canterbury, are the only mediæval Saints commemorated in the First Text. SS. Bernardin of Sienna, Elizabeth of Hungary,

<sup>1</sup> The language of the Renaissance writers of some of Quignon's lessons would shock a mediæval purist. For instance, St. Antony of Padua (June 13) hears of the martyrdom 'quorundam monachorum ex ordine sancti Francisci,' and St. Thomas Aquinas (March 7) is 'monachus prædicatorum.'

Peter Martyr, are added in the Second Text ; the calendar of which also contains the names of certain Saints, to whom no special third lesson is appointed, as SS. George, Louis king of France, Giles, Thecla, Ursula and her companions, with several popes. In both texts St. Perpetua disappears altogether before St. Thomas of Aquinum, and it would seem to be almost the first instance in which the calendar of a Roman Breviary thus degrades St. Perpetua. In the early calendars she retains the first place with a commemoration of St. Thomas ; in the Pian Breviary, St. Thomas takes the first place with a commemoration of St. Perpetua. It has been often foretold that if new Saints be admitted to the Calendar they will eject the old, and this is a notable instance ; for great as St. Thomas may be in the history of philosophy, St. Perpetua is still one of the very few Saints that have the honour of being named in the Canon of the Mass.

Nearly every one of the early popes, from Linus, Cletus, and Clement, down to Sylvester, is commemorated, even including Marcellinus (April 26), in whose lesson we read that he committed idolatry in the reign of Diocletian. It is said that this is the first mention in a Roman Breviary of what is called 'the fable of Sinuessæ,'<sup>1</sup> and this again is due to Quignon's close following of Platina's *Lives*, which are the source, not only of the lesson for Marcellinus, but of those for all the popes commemorated by Quignon. Out of the 143 immovable feasts of the First Text there are thirty-one popes who have days and lessons assigned to them ; that is, more than a fifth of the whole. There is much the same number in the Second Text, but some of the names have been changed, and some have no particular lessons. Quignon has thus maintained the right of his compilation to the name of a Roman Breviary, and he has also admitted several of the Saints that Rudolf of Tongern complains are local Roman Saints and not Gregorian, and are yet to be found in the new Romano-Franciscan Calendars.

In other matters Quignon has done better ; for example. St. Justin Martyr appears on April 13, while the ordinary Roman Calendar had to wait for our own day to give this Father a special office.

It may be well to note, before leaving the subject of the *Sanctorale*, that Quignon begins the lessons with January, not, as in the older Breviaries, with a day close to St. Andrew ; Christmas and Epiphany also are in the *Sanctorale*, not in the

<sup>1</sup> Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1873, 2te Auflage, Bd. i. S. 143) uses a stronger expression : 'eine Lüge.'



*Dominicale.* St. Stephen and the attendant feasts may be found in the *Sanctorale* of some Breviaries; but it is probably a novelty of Quignon's to set Christmas itself amongst the Saints' days. In the *Breviarium Humiliatum*, which is a sort of cousin to Quignon, Christmas and Epiphany are also in the *Sanctorale*.

In the arrangement of Mattins and Lauds, Quignon made considerable changes; but with the other Hours, especially in the Little Hours, the changes are not so very prominent. In the First Text the Hours all begin with *Pater noster*; in the Second the *Ave Maria* down to *peccatoribus* is added. It is just possible that this may be the first appearance of the *Ave Maria* in this place in a Breviary calling itself Roman, and if this be the case it was likely enough added to make up in some way for Quignon's abolition of the Little Office of the B.V.M.

A very noteworthy variation from the old order may be found in the appearance of the *Confiteor* at the beginning of Mattins, and its omission from Prime and Compline. It may be also that this is the first appearance in a Roman Breviary of the *Confiteor* exactly word for word in its present form, though a *Confiteor* very nearly the same may be found in Roman Breviaries printed before the date of the First Text,<sup>1</sup> and in a manuscript *Ordo Romanus*.<sup>2</sup>

After the *Confiteor* at Mattins comes the *Domine labia* with the *Gloria Patri*, as in the older service; then the Invitatory<sup>3</sup> with the *Venite* in the 'Itala' version as in the old books; then the old Breviary Hymn; after this the three Quignonian Psalms of the day; then *Pater noster*, and the three lessons of the day, each preceded by a benediction, as in the old books. After the lessons, the *Te Deum*, unless it be Advent or Lent (when *Miserere* is said in place of the *Te Deum*). Lauds is

<sup>1</sup> *Breviarium Romanum*, Venetiis, Junta, 1534.

<sup>2</sup> *Ordo Romanus* XIV. in Mabillon's *Museum Italicum*, Lut. Paris. 1724, tom. ii. p. 329.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Neale says of the Advent Invitatory of Quignon: 'How unfavourable a contrast with the Roman' (*Essays on Liturgiology*, London, 1863, p. 8). It is hardly fair to Quignon to accuse him of innovation when he has retained an old feature which the modern Roman has dropped; for, to tell the truth, Quignon has merely taken over this Invitatory from the old Roman Breviary, where it was the Invitatory for the Third Sunday in Advent. Dr. Neale adds: 'But Quignon, true to his Scriptural principle, continually inserted texts in this position which were not in the least calculated for it.' This is quite a false criticism of Quignon. Out of forty-one Invitatories there are only six which cannot be found in the Roman Breviary before Quignon, and these new Invitatories are not 'texts.'

said  
at th  
of th  
the s  
T

hym  
with  
speci  
takes  
like t  
begin  
pline  
judg  
Illu  
Visi

the o  
which  
which  
and c  
Quig  
in the  
antipl  
B.V.M.  
which  
dum r  
Comp  
printi  
with t  
souls s

Qu  
Brevia  
Blesse  
former  
nary o  
Mary,  
lect. F  
said on  
Text a  
From t  
of the  
departe

<sup>1</sup> F.  
Antiph  
1868, p.

<sup>2</sup> Pu  
VOL.

said much like the Little Hours, but with no hymn, and a Collect at the end of *Benedictus*. After the Collect a commemoration of the B.V.M. and All Saints, taken from the old book, and the service ends with *Fidelium animæ*.

The Little Hours begin with *Deus in adiutorium*, the old hymn, then the three Psalms and the Collect of the day, ending with *Fidelium*. At Prime, however, *Credo* is said before the special Collect for Prime. On all Sundays *Quicunque vult* takes the place of *Credo*. Vespers and Compline are arranged like the Little Hours, and, like them, the hymn comes at the beginning before the Psalms. *Visita* is the Collect for Compline, from the old Breviary, and if Quignon had had good judgment we think he would have here brought back the old *Illumina* (*Lighten our darkness*) instead of the monastic *Visita*, considering the purpose for which he was compiling the office. At the end of Compline there is *Salve Regina*, to which in the Second Text *Regina cæli* is added for Easter. Of which Zaccaria says (and his statement has been copied over and over again) that these antiphons were borrowed from Quignon and put into the Roman Breviary by Pius V.<sup>1</sup> But in the early printed Roman Breviaries all four, or even five, antiphons will be found at the end of the Compline of the B.V.M. There is a *Breviarium de Camera*, printed in 1500, which has the four antiphons in this place, and another *secundum ritum Romanæ curiæ*, 1479, with *Regina cæli* after the Compline of the B.V.M. Even before the invention of printing *Salve Regina* would seem to have been associated with the idea of evening and of Compline. Dante makes the souls sing together the *Salve Regina* and *Te lucis ante*.<sup>2</sup>

Quignon abolished two very important features in the old Breviary—the frequent recitation of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and that of the dead. Instead of the former, on all Saturdays with some few exceptions, the ordinary office was celebrated in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, with a special invitatory, hymn, third lesson, and Collect. For the dead, in the First Text, a special office was to be said only once in the year, on November 2; but in the Second Text a few Fridays in Lent were added to All Souls' Day. From these changes a tendency to a diminution of the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the commemoration of the departed may perhaps be suspected; and this suspicion, to-

<sup>1</sup> F. A. Zaccaria, *Onomasticon Rituale*, Faventia, 1787, p. 24 *sub voce* Antiphona. Cf. Ferdinand Probst, *Brevier und Breviergebet*, Tübingen, 1868, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *Purgatorio*, vii. 82, and viii. 13.

gether with the absence of any readings from the Apocrypha in the First Text, may have led to the accusation of a Protestant tendency that we see every now and then formulated against Quignon's book. All contemporary writers are, however, unanimous in acquitting the Cardinal himself of any such leanings.

The system of versicle and response, which is much developed in the old Breviary, is hardly seen at all in either text of Quignon. In neither are there responds after the lessons, nor *preces* before the Collect on weekdays, not even at Prime or Compline. *Preces* are indeed to be found in the Litany for Ash Wednesday and the Fridays in Lent which in the First Text is printed with the Ash Wednesday service, and in the Second Text at the end of the book. Elsewhere the system of verse and respond is represented mainly by short instances, as the *Deus in adiutorium* before the Hours, or the *Domine exaudi* before the Collect. The Blessings before the lessons have been preserved in both texts.

What was Quignon's motive in abolishing so much of the shorter variable parts of the Breviary, such as responds, antiphons, little chapters, and the like? A learned and accomplished writer in the *Tablet* (May 12, 1888, p. 762) remarks that 'Quignon saw with a just historical instinct what indeed is clear enough on a moment's reflection on the case, that antiphons, responsories, versicles, and hymns were originally incidents of choral and public recitation of the Divine Office, where choir answers choir and voice.' We believe ourselves that a desire to simplify the office and to lessen the amount of variables was certainly another motive, while it would seem from Quignon's own words that the main reason was to remove all that hindered the reading of Holy Scripture: 'Omissis antiphonis, capitulis, et responsoriis, ac multis hymnis, cæterisque id genus *Scripturæ Sacræ lectionem impediētibz*' (Preface, p. xxi). It does not seem quite clear how antiphons and hymns, except by taking up time, could hinder the reading of Holy Scripture; but responds and versicles certainly interrupted the continuous reading of the lessons. This is a fault from which the modern Breviary is not free, a fact which we learn on the good authority of a Roman Catholic priest, who, as he discusses the reform of Quignon in the *Tablet* for June 9, 1888, tells us that he has said his office for forty years:—

'Nor did I wish we had Cardinal Quignon's Breviary for its simplicity, but because it goes through the whole Psalter, giving different Psalms for every day instead of the few which we repeat over and

over  
Holy  
gru  
histo  
Dag  
serv  
from

If a  
be n  
and  
Quig  
abol  
seem  
texts  
in Ca  
Offic  
churc  
they  
Table  
metri

Q  
and  
All t  
not c  
were  
in di  
hymn  
Matti  
has t  
hymn  
in Ac  
hymn  
beata,  
ordina

1 T  
not a b  
in the c  
a still m  
is not a  
labit ha  
2 'P  
tinam  
remotis  
strant,  
1754, ec

over again day after day, and because it has *consecutive readings of Holy Scripture, instead of fractional portions interrupted by incongruous responds*; as for example this very day we read a bit of the history of the idol Dagon, and at the words "and only the stump of Dagon remained in his place," we add, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord,"<sup>1</sup> by way of respond, fetched from the other end of the Breviary' (p. 932).

To return to the arguments of the reviewer in the *Tablet*: If a solitary priest recited the Breviary in private there could be no voice raised against voice and no answer to the *Versus*, and accordingly no antiphons or responds were retained by Quignon. If this be acknowledged as the main reason of abolition, the motive for keeping the metrical hymns does not seem plain, and yet a number of such may be found in both texts. And in connexion with this it should be noticed that in Cardinal Thomasius's scheme for the recitation of the Divine Office, either in private or in confraternity chapels and country churches, the antiphons and responds are left out, because they presuppose a choir of singers,<sup>2</sup> as the reviewer in the *Tablet* tells us; yet in this cardinal's scheme no trace of metrical hymns appears.

Quignon altogether abolished only the hymns at Lauds, and no special hymns for Mattins were retained on weekdays. All the hymns in Quignon are taken from the old Breviary, not one from the *Novi Hymni Ecclesiastici* of Ferreri, which were allowed, by the brief of Clement VII., to be said *etiam in divinis* and to be used by any priest. Most of Quignon's hymns from the old Breviary are for the same season and hour. Mattins and Lauds being considered as one hour, Quignon has thought himself at liberty to choose either of the old hymns of the night offices for his Mattin office; for example, in Advent *Vox clara*, and at Easter *Aurora lucis*, the old hymns for Lauds, are said at Quignon's Mattins; and *O Lux beata*, the Saturday hymn at Vespers, has been taken for the ordinary Vesper hymn. The arrangement of the Lenten

<sup>1</sup> This 'incongruous respond' may occur when a feast of a confessor not a bishop (e.g. St. Francis Caracciolo, June 4) falls upon the Monday in the octave of Corpus Christi. A friend points out what he considers a still more curious respond in the First Nocturn of Corpus Christi, which is not an accident but an incident, and therefore less excusable: 'Immolabit hædum, etc. Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Hinc videtur ipsum privatum officium revocandum esse ad pristinam normam constantem ex Psalmis et lectionibus sacre Scripturæ, remotis antiphonis, et responsoriis; quæ, ut eorundem nomina demonstrant, cœtum canentium requirunt' (Thomasius, *Opera omnia*, Romæ, 1754, ed. Vezzosi, t. vii. p. 65).

hymns in the two texts may be noticed. In the old Breviary the Lenten hymns did not begin till the first Sunday; in both texts of Quignon they begin on Ash Wednesday, but the First Text has a different hymn and a different arrangement from the Second. The First Text recites *Audi benigne conditor*, an old Vesper hymn, at Mattins; but *Aures ad nostras* at Vespers, as in the old book. The Second Text throws away *Aures ad nostras* altogether, and recites *Audi benigne* at Vespers and *Ex more docti mystico* at Mattins, as in the old book. In neither text was there a change of hymns until Passiontide, and all metrical hymns were discontinued during the last three days of Holy Week, in accordance with ancient custom. But a departure from tradition may be noticed at Easter. During the Octave no hymns were sung in the old service; but Quignon introduces *Aurora lucis* into the Mattins of Easter Day and *Ad cœnam agni* at Vespers.

There is little to be said about the Collects of Quignon. There are but two in the First Text which cannot be found in the Breviary of 1534, and these two can be found in earlier books. And the Collects seem to be assigned to the old days and seasons; though in the First Text the Collect for the Saturday in Whitsun Week is said also on the Thursday, yet in the Second Text a return to the Sunday Collect is ordered, as in the old Breviary. Wonderful to relate, all Collects were left out in Cardinal Thomasius's scheme for a popular Breviary; he says they were anciently reserved to priests to recite, not even a deacon being allowed to say them.

The first allusion to a likeness of the Anglican Liturgy to Quignon's revision that we have yet met with is in the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* of Schultingius,<sup>1</sup> published in 1599. Doubtless there are others earlier, but they are yet to be discovered. In modern times attention was drawn to Quignon by a writer of one of the Oxford Tracts, No. 75 (probably Cardinal Newman), in 1836. Afterwards Sir William Palmer, in the later editions of *Origines Liturgicæ* (not in the first or third, but certainly in the fourth, edition—that of 1845), printed extracts from the prefaces of the Prayer-Book and of Quignon's Breviary in parallel columns. Since that time the connexion of Quignon with the Book of Common Prayer has often been noticed.

The most striking proof of the connexion of Quignon with the Book of Common Prayer is to be found in the

<sup>1</sup> In a marginal note of p. 101 in t. i. pars 1, cap. xxxviii.: 'Hæ etiam rationes valent ad Anglicanistarum formulam quæ similis est huic' (*i.e.* Quignoniano Breviario).

pre  
Book  
First  
our  
of th  
as so  
of th  
until  
Clem  
leavi  
Pref

by th  
or so  
(in c  
been  
thing  
the  
Chur  
servi  
grou  
searc  
he sh  
not c  
pose,  
ment  
order  
whol  
there  
in th  
that  
such  
cong  
readi  
word  
them  
also  
some  
them  
truth  
peop  
scrip  
shou  
and  
God,  
with  
But

prefaces of the two books. The compilers of Edward's First Book must have had, it would seem, the preface to Quignon's First Text before them when they wrote the preface, which in our present book is the introduction 'concerning the Services of the Church.' They begin to translate Quignon's preface as soon as he has given his three reasons for the institution of the Canonical Hours, and they then continue the paraphrase until he begins to speak of the command laid on him by Clement VII. We place the two documents side by side, leaving out nothing of either.

*Preface to Edward VI's Prayer-Book of 1549.*

*Quignon's Preface, First Text.*  
(P. xx.)

'There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so surely established, which (in continuance of time) hath not been corrupted: as (among other things) it may plainly appear by the common prayers in the Church, commonly called divine service: the first original and ground whereof if a man would search out by the ancient fathers, he shall find that the same was not ordained, but of a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness: for they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once in the year, intending thereby, that the Clergy, and specially such as were Ministers of the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation of God's word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able also to exhort other by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth. And further, that the people (by daily hearing of holy scripture read in the Church) should continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion. But these many years passed,

'Et profecto si quis modum precandi olim a maioribus traditum diligenter consyderet, horum omnium ab ipsis habitam esse rationem manifesto deprehenderet.

Sed factum est nescio quo pacto



this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories, Legends, Responds, Verses, vain repetitions, Commemorations, and Synodals, that commonly when any book of the Bible was begun, before three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread. And in this sort, the book of Esaie was begun in Advent, and the book of Genesis in Septuagesima: but they were only begun, and never read through. After a like sort were other books of holy scripture used.

‘And moreover, whereas S. Paul would have such language spoken to the people in the Church, as they might understand, and have profit by hearing the same; the service in this Church of England (these many years) hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understood not; so that they have heard with their ears only, and their hearts, spirit, and mind, have not been edified thereby.

‘And furthermore, notwithstanding that the ancient fathers had divided the Psalms into seven portions, whereof every one was called a nocturn; now of late time a few of them have been daily said (and oft repeated) and the rest utterly omitted.

‘Moreover, the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie, and the manifold changings of the service, was the cause, that to turn the book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be

hominum negligentia, ut paulatim a sanctissimis illis veterum patrum institutis discederetur.

Nam primum libri sacrae scripturae, qui statis anni temporibus erant perlegendi, vixdum incœpti a precantibus præmittuntur. Ut exemplo esse possunt liber Genesis, qui incipitur in septuagesima, et liber Isaia, qui in adventu, quorum vix singula capitula perlegimus, ac eodem modo cætera veteris testamenti volumina degustamus magis, quam legimus, nec secus accidit in evangelia, et reliquam scripturam novi testamenti, quorum in loco successerunt alia, nec utilitate cum his, nec gravitate comparanda, quæ quotidie agitatione linguæ magis quam intentione mentis inculcantur.

‘Deinde psalmodum plerisque, qui singulis hebdomadae diebus erant destinati, reiectis, pauci quidam toto fere anno repetuntur. Tum historiae sanctorum tam inculte et tam negligenti iudicio scriptae leguntur, ut nec auctoritatem habere videantur nec gravitatem.

‘Accedit tam perplexus ordo, tamque difficilis precandi ratio, ut interdum paulo minor opera in inquirendo ponatur quam cum inveneris in legendo.’

read, than to read it when it was found out.'

At this point the parallelism of the two documents ceases for a time, but there are one or two passages later which seem to be connected with each other; for example:—

(P. xxi.)

'For this cause be cut off Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the scripture. Yet because there is no remedy but that of necessity there must be some rules: therefore certain rules are here set forth, which as they be few in number, so they be plain and easy to be understood.'

'Omissis antiphonis, capitulis, et responsoriis, ac multis hymnis, cæterisque id genus rebus scripturæ sacræ lectionem impediētib.

'Fieri non potuit, ut regulas omnino vitaremus, quarum tam plenum erat prius breviarium, ut vix ætas hominis ad earum rationem perdiscendam sufficeret, sed nos tam raras et perspicuas regulas disposuimus, ut eas cuiusvis facile sit intelligere.'

The rest of the paragraph that follows after 'understanded' may very well be compared with the paragraphs *Quod pertinet* on p. xxi and *Discrimen igitur* on p. xxiii and the following page; but the verbal likeness is not so great as in those which have gone before. Attention does not seem to have been as yet drawn to the subjoined paragraph from the Book of 1549, which was first omitted in 1662, and of which the resemblance to the end of the Preface in both Texts of Quignon is very great.

Edward VI.'s First Book.<sup>1</sup>

'And if any would judge this way more painful, because that all things must be read upon the book, whereas before, by the reason of so often repetition, they could say many things by heart: if those men will weigh their labour, with the profit in knowledge, which daily they shall obtain by reading upon the book, they will not refuse the pain, in consideration of the great profit that shall ensue thereof.'

Quignon, p. xxv.

'Si cui autem laboriosum in hoc breviario videbitur pleraque omnia ex libro legi, cum multa in alio quæ propter frequentem repetitionem ediscuntur, memoriter pronuntientur, compenset cum hoc labore cognitionem Scripturæ Sacræ, quæ sic in dies augescit, et intentionem animi quam Deus ante omnia in precantibus requirit (hanc enim maiorem legentibus, quam memoriter proferentibus adesse necesse est) et huiusmodi laborem non

<sup>1</sup> Our references to Edward VI.'s First Book are taken from Mr. Parker's reprint (Oxford, 1877).

modo fructuosum, sed etiam salutarem iudicabit.'

It seems impossible to resist the conclusion that the English is a translation of the Latin. Even the Preface of the Second Text, where the resemblance is much less, suggested a comparison to Cardinal Newman and Sir William Palmer. In the First Text the likeness is much greater. Those who think that the Common Prayer itself has no relation to Quignon's Breviary acknowledge, perhaps with reluctance, the connexion of the two prefaces.

In many points the aims of the two books seem to have been alike. Both wished to make the Sunday and Saints' day service identical in structure with the weekday service. Both wished to reduce to a minimum the variable parts of the service, to cut off all antiphons, little chapters, and responds, and to make the rules for recitation as few and as simple as possible. Both, too, aimed at and secured the recitation of the whole of the Psalter, in one case every week, in the other every month, though the attempt to ensure the reading of the greater part of the Bible during the year was not so entirely successful in Quignon as in the English Book. They endeavoured to secure this point by omitting the large amount of variables in the old service, especially the responds, which interfered very much with the continuous reading of the Scripture. A great motive in the English Book for the omission of variables was no doubt simplification. The variables were cut off because they hindered a ready understanding of the service, tending to cumber the common prayer, in which it was hoped that persons without any liturgical education would be induced to join were it only simple enough.

This was also clearly the intention of the Venerable Cardinal Thomasius.<sup>1</sup> His scheme for a popular Breviary was far simpler even than the Anglican Mattins and Evensong; and yet it was the work of a better ritualist and scholar than Quignon. It consisted solely of the Psalms, lessons from the Old and New Testament, and the Lord's Prayer, which was said in the place of the Collect, as in ancient times it was said at the Lateran. There was absolutely nothing left but the Psalms, Canticles, and Holy Scripture; not a Collect, homily, legend, respond, or anthem survived. The Psalter daily used was the Gregorian, and no proper Psalms were allowed, save on great festivals like Easter and Christmas. The Scripture Canticles remained from the old Breviary. Three lessons were daily

<sup>1</sup> *De privato ecclesiasticorum officiorum breviario extra chorum* in Thomasius' *Opera Omnia*, t. vii. p. 62, ed. Vezzosi.

read from Holy Scripture—the first two usually from the Old Testament, except at Easter; the third from the Gospel. The seven epistles to the Churches in the Revelation were read as lessons throughout the week at Vespers.

It will be seen that as a thorough reformer Cardinal Thomasius leaves Cardinal Quignon far behind. The form of Cardinal Thomasius's scheme would have satisfied a Puritan, except so far that it was a form at all. And yet the scheme itself is thoroughly ancient and Gelasian in tone,<sup>1</sup> composed by one whose name is known to every liturgical scholar, and whose piety is attested by the process of canonization, the first stage of which has been reached at Rome. It is a pity that an ideal of this kind had not been present to the minds of those who are responsible for the most unfortunate of modern ecclesiastical Acts, the 'Shortened Services Act.'

One feature which both Quignon and Thomasius have thrown away has been most happily retained in the English Book; we mean the *preces* which follow the Creed and precede the saying of the Collect for the day. There appears some evidence that the desire of the compilers of the Prayer-Book was not to destroy liturgical forms, but to simplify them. The *preces* are the same all the year round, unlike the ever-varying responds to the lessons; and an unlearned congregation can therefore readily join in them. In one fragment of the *preces*, the second Common Prayer has followed both Texts of Quignon by suppressing *The Lord be with you* with its respond immediately before the Collects.

If we begin to examine details we shall find further points of resemblance. In Quignon's Calendar there is a reference for the third lesson of every day, whether it be a Saint's day or unoccupied; and this may have been developed in the Anglican Calendar into its *Table of Lessons*, both first and second. The source of the Anglican lessons also seems to have been suggested by Quignon, the first lesson being taken from the Old Testament, the second from the New Testament, while the third lessons taken on unoccupied days from the Epistles and Acts seem to have suggested the second lessons at Evensong, which, before the revision of the Lectionary, came mainly from the Epistles. In the same way both books read only one or two chapters of the Apocalypse.

<sup>1</sup> In Blanchini's edition of Thomasius (p. 463) the plan is said to have been laid before the S. Congregation of Rites at Rome; but whether it received praise or blame is not said.

The presence of the Confession and Absolution at the beginning of the Morning and Evening Prayer of Edward's Second Book has been thought to be a borrowing from Quignon, as in both Texts Quignon directs the *Confiteor* and Absolution to be said before Mattins.

The daily recitation of the *Te Deum*, except in Lent, was ordered in Edward's First Book. This may very likely be a borrowing from Quignon; for in the old Breviary the *Te Deum* is a distinct note of a festival, and was not said in the ferial office, into which Quignon appears to have introduced it in accordance with his scheme for equalizing festival and week day.

We know that *Quicumque vult* was anciently recited on all Sundays at Prime, and the *Credo* was also recited afterwards in the *preces*. In Quignon *Quicumque* is said instead of *Credo* on Sundays; and a writer in the *London Diocesan Magazine* (July 1888, p. 78) suggests, with much likelihood, that this rubric of Quignon may have been the source of the Anglican substitution of the Athanasian for the Apostles' Creed on certain festivals.

In the Second Text of Quignon there is a direction to use the service of the Circumcision over again before the Epiphany, and this may have suggested the rubric in the Prayer-Book that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel of the Circumcision are to be used every day until the Epiphany.

It has been sometimes said that the frequent joining together of three Psalms in the Mattins and Evensong of the Common Prayer-Book is a survival of the Quignonian distribution, which gave three Psalms to each canonical hour. To support this, it is said, the proper Psalms are all linked in threes, except those for Evensong on Good Friday and Whitsunday. The Psalms in the offices of the Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge for the commemoration of benefactors are often in threes; so was the daily office of St. Bartholomew's Hospital in 1552. But a closer examination of the Psalms appointed for daily recitation does not bear out this theory. Omitting Psalm cxix., the Psalms arranged in threes at Mattins and Evensong do not equal those disposed differently, and apparent opportunities for bracketing together three Psalms seem to have been lost. For example, on the 16th or the 23rd day what would have been easier than to have read three Psalms at Mattins and three Psalms at Evensong had there been any wish to do so? And on the 19th the *Venite* might have been put aside as the Invitatory, and thus six Psalms would have been left to be equally divided for

more  
four  
com  
Psal  
an i  
that  
and

A  
allow  
revis  
new  
Fren  
Brev  
the  
chur  
dina  
affor  
and  
of th

A  
Lett

In a  
and  
about

it a l  
self!  
wide  
the e  
as ye  
the s  
up h

morning and evening, instead of three for the morning and four for the evening. There hardly seems evidence that the compilers of Edward's First Book deliberately chose three Psalms in preference to any other number. It may be that an idea common to both Quignon and the Prayer-Book was that the Psalms of each office were to be about equal in length, and thus the number three is prominent in both.

An interesting study could be made, if time and space allowed, as to the influence of Quignon's reform upon the revision of the Breviary made by Pius V., especially upon the new *Legenda* of the Saints which were then written; upon the French revision of the Breviary, especially upon the private Breviary of Colbert; and upon schemes for further reform of the Breviary for recitation in private or in small parish churches, like that we have mentioned of the Venerable Cardinal Thomasius. A prolonged examination of these would afford most interesting matter to the student of Liturgies, and would not be without value for the right understanding of the Book of Common Prayer.

#### ART. VII.—DOROTHY OSBORNE'S LETTERS.

*Letters from Dorothy Osborne to Sir William Temple, 1652-54.*

Edited by EDWARD ABBOTT PARRY, Barrister-at-Law. Fourth edition. Printed for Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, successors to Newbery and Harris, at the sign of the Bible and Sun. (London, and Sydney, New South Wales, 1888.)

IN a paper printed in Carlyle's *Miscellaneous Essays*, that acrid and somewhat affected writer complains in characteristic terms about the obscurity of Civil War documents:—

'We had long heard,' he says, 'of Dulness, and thought we knew it a little; but here first *is* the right dead Dulness, Dulness its very self! Ditch-water, fetid bilge-water, ponds of it and oceans of it; wide-spread genuine Dulness, without parallel in this world: such is the element in which that history of our Heroic Seventeenth Century as yet rots and swims! The hapless inquirer swashes to and fro, in the sorrow of his heart: if in an acre of stagnant water he can pick up half a peascod, let him thank his stars!' (vol. vi. p. 143, ed. 1869).



From this terrific indictment Carlyle exempts the account given by Sir Simon D'Ewes of a Suffolk election to the Long Parliament, as presenting 'the express image of Old Ipswich and Old England' on that windy day, October 19, 1640, when the aforesaid election was held, and he urges in his picturesque fashion that such 'a little fact, if we meditate it, and picture in any measure the general humour and condition of the England that then was, will spread itself into great expanse in our imagination.'

It is on like grounds that we commend the perusal of these *Letters*, written by Mistress Dorothy Osborne in the years of grace 1653, 1654 to William Temple. They have not, indeed, to do with those stormy days, pregnant with mighty issues for the Stuart dynasty and for Europe, when amidst fierce tumult Cavalier and Puritan were striving for the mastery. The iron hand of the Protector, in the cant phrase of the day, 'had subdued the foes of the Houses and of the Word,' and sternly repressed all overt rebellion. The Royalist gentry, broken and scattered, with maimed fortunes and diminished honour, sullenly submitted to the rule of the Huntingdonshire farmer-squire, and we would fain have a glimpse of their home life in that ill-omened period. The broad division into roystering Cavaliers and sour-visaged Puritans is of course a misleading generalization and caricature; and in these letters we have just such an insight as we long for into the daily lives of our cultured, well-bred ancestors. It is the picture of a genuine English home, and a peep into the heart and life of a genuine, well-bred English maiden.

We question whether a more singular destiny ever awaited a young lady's love-letters than that which has befallen the delightful collection now before us. Their authenticity is beyond dispute. They were left by Sir William Temple to his granddaughter, Mrs. Temple, who died childless in 1722, and who bequeathed them to her only nephew, the Rev. Nicholas Bacon, of Coddanham Vicarage, Suffolk. Mr. Bacon was the last lineal descendant of Sir William and Dorothy Temple, and at his death in 1796 the vicarage of Coddanham, with its furniture and contents, passed to his sister-in-law and her husband, the parents of the Rev. Robert Longe, their present owner. We may note in passing that there was only an interval of four years between the death of Mr. Bacon in 1796 and the birth, in 1800, of the Rev. R. Longe, by whom the cabinet in which the letters were placed has been chivalrously guarded, and through whose kindness we are now permitted

to enjoy them. Thus for two centuries they have been stored in the quiet oblivion of a country village, subject only to very occasional perusal. Fifty years ago a lofty historian, the Right Hon. Thomas Peregrine Courtenay, intent upon the stately negotiations and protocols through which Sir William Temple won his laurels in the arena of diplomacy, glanced at them with half-apologetic, half-contemptuous acknowledgment, and even deigned to devote a few pages of his Appendix to some extracts which he feared were sadly beneath 'the dignity of history,' an expression for which he was adequately chastised by Macaulay. It is half-a-century later before the entire correspondence sees the light, and we cannot but unfeignedly rejoice that they have not been published prematurely. The volume is emphatically *felix opportunitate emissionis*. For years its contents have been the study of one who has lavished pains to elucidate every allusion in them; and Mr. Parry, their present editor, reaps all the benefit of the care and industry thus ungrudgingly bestowed. The task so admirably begun has been well completed. Each letter is accompanied by a terse but lucid explanation of all that needs to be explained about the facts or persons referred to. As we read them it occurs to us what a subject they would have afforded for dainty comment by Thackeray's kindly satire. How genially he would have moralized in his own half-earnest, half-mocking style over these remnants of a buried love that perished two centuries ago. They bear the stamp of no ordinary mind, and their publication would have been amply justified if they had been written by anyone less notable than the wife of William Temple and the intimate friend of our English Mary Stuart.

Let us introduce the principal actors in this domestic drama. Sir Peter Osborne, the father of Dorothy, a staunch loyalist and gentleman of ample estate, held the castle of Guernsey for the king during the Civil Wars, and maintained his position without thought of surrender, although he and his garrison were reduced to a single biscuit a day, besides herbs and limpets, and had to warm themselves by pulling up the castle floors and using them for fuel. It is mournfully characteristic of those evil days that this gallant officer was both maligned and deprived of help by Carteret, the royalist governor of Jersey, was induced to hold out against the enemy by delusive promises of succour which were impossible of fulfilment, and was most ungratefully superseded in his command by those whom he had served through terrible privations which carried him, after a few years of suffering, to his

grave. During the siege of his castle Lady Osborne and her daughter went to live at St. Malo, whence they despatched such succour to Guernsey as could be secured ; but the elder lady succumbed to the unwonted exertions and privations thus imposed on her, and Dorothy returned to Chicksands, her ancestral home, with her invalided father, who was now broken alike in health and fortune ; his income reduced from 4,000*l.* to 400*l.* a year, and himself almost completely confined by sickness to his chamber. It was under these circumstances that the letters before us were written. Seriously straitened in resources, the loyal upholders of a fallen cause, the Osbornes still held their high social position amongst the great county families around them, and Dorothy's attractions, personal and mental, commanded a host of 'servants,' as it was the fashion of that time to call avowed suitors. Amongst these there figured Henry Cromwell, second son of the Protector, then at the zenith of his power ; but Dorothy's preference was for William Temple, son of the Irish Master of the Rolls.

Macaulay has related the incident which first inspired the heart of Temple with tenderness for Mistress Dorothy. The story of their love is sufficiently romantic. Sir John Temple had another alliance in view for his son, and thought Dorothy's portion of 4,000*l.* far below what he should aspire to. Her own brother was equally averse to the match. William Temple, in his judgment, had neither the fixed principles nor the sufficient fortune he desired in his sister's husband. The poor girl, in close and most trying attendance on her sick father, was distracted between the urgent importunity of her lover and her brother's angry antagonism, whose wrath broke out anew at every fresh rejection of a more eligible suitor. The situation was aggravated by the genuine affection of Dorothy for her brother. Their quarrels and reconciliations are described with all the vivacity of the maiden's graphic pen.

We must premise a few remarks upon the diction in vogue when these letters were composed. Despite the deep intimacy between the correspondents, they all commence with the formal 'Sir,' and the conclusion is commonly 'I am, yours.' In an early letter Dorothy entreats Temple not to speak of 'love,' and to be content with the less ardent term friendship. But this coyness wears off in time. A somewhat frequent use of expletives such as 'Lord' and 'I'll swear' indicate that such expressions were not then deemed unsuited to a lady's lips. Besides these we might possibly recall a word or two that modern taste would reject, and the idiom is of course that which was current in that age ; but there is not a thought

which the most refined gentlewoman of our own day need blush to have harboured. Mistress Dorothy's gradual and largely unconscious revelation of herself is very winning. Here are some early details of temperament and character:—

'Tis not that I am sad (for as long as you and the rest of my friends are well), I thank God I have no occasion to be so, but I never appear to be very merry, and if I had all that I could wish for in the world, I do not think it would make any visible change in my humour. . . . You have reason to think your father kind, and I have reason to think him very civil; all his scruples are very just ones, but such as time and a little good fortune (if we were either of us lucky to it) might satisfy. He may be confident I can never think of disposing of myself without my father's consent; and though he has left it more in my power than almost anybody leaves a daughter, yet I were certainly the worst-natured person in the world if his kindness were not a greater tie upon me than any advantage he could have reserved. Besides that, 'tis my duty, from which nothing can ever tempt me, nor could you like it in me if I should do otherwise, 'twould make me unworthy of your esteem; but if ever that may be obtained, or I left free, and you in the same condition, all the advantages of fortune or person imaginable met together in one man should not be preferred before you. I think I cannot leave you better than with this assurance' (pp. 72-3).

This extract is essentially characteristic of the writer. Throughout her letters there is no trifling with deep feeling, no spurious sentiment, no false affectation of indifference. Her nature was essentially transparent. 'I cannot,' she says, 'disguise my humour.' Her very playfulness is so essentially the mark of an earnest and resolute mind that we are amazed to find Lord Macaulay's critical acumen so much at fault as to describe her correspondence as 'engaging namby-pamby.' It would be hard, we imagine, to find a young woman who, under trying conditions, showed less vacillation or displayed a clearer understanding of the course which duty and self-respect required. Macaulay's phrase may have been suggested by the naïve and essentially feminine coquetry with which Dorothy occasionally rallies her lover, whose own mood seems to have alternated between a provoking negligence of her small commissions and a too-obtrusive and ill-timed urgency. But if she sportingly feigns indifference, the disguise is intentionally transparent, and nothing can be prettier or more maidenly than the tenderness with which she gives expression to her regard. At times, with arch demureness, she professes a willingness to find a rich heiress for Temple, and presently she gives an unexpected and sprightly turn to her sentence which reveals how true a heart is beating beneath the mask

she for a moment has assumed. She bears herself throughout with unflinching dignity, and at times with a sweet, stately English grace that is irresistible.

If we follow Carlyle's suggestion, by meditation upon many 'a little fact' scattered through these pages, we can in some measure picture the condition of the England that then was. Communication is tedious and uncertain, and the letters have to be brought by special messengers from London and left at some address agreed upon between the lovers. Domestic comfort and refinement are only partially prevalent, even in the homes of the upper ten, and rich men are spoken of as taking their brides to houses little better than barns. The spleen is the most fashionable of disorders, for which the accepted specific is copious draughts of salts, and crowds frequent Epsom, not to attend its race-meetings, but to drink of its saline springs. The taste for *bric-à-brac* takes the form of collecting seals, which are prized in proportion to their size and the quaintness of the device engraved upon them. The field of fiction is occupied by ponderous romances, mostly translated from the French. They consist mainly of a string of tales, spread over several volumes, and rival the earlier English novels in prolixity. They are as yet the exclusive property of the few, and are passed from hand to hand for perusal. London society was as full of engagements as could be crushed into the space of every twenty-four hours. 'We go abroad all day, and play all night, and say our prayers when we have time.' And amongst the lions of a day when spirit-rapping and clairvoyance are as yet unheard of is William Lilly, the astrologer; but he does not number Mistress Dorothy among his dupes.

'I confess I always thought him an impostor, but I could never have imagined him so simple as we found him. . . . He asked us more questions than we did him, and caught at everything we said without discerning that we abused him, and said things purposely to confound him; which we did so perfectly that we made him contradict himself the strongest that ever you saw' (p. 300).

The allusions to contemporary politics are so few and guarded as to suggest the need of caution under the existing *régime*; but Dorothy cannot refrain from a pertinent query on the dissolution of the Long Parliament:—

'If Mr. Pim were alive again, I wonder what he would think of these proceedings, and whether this would appear so great a breach of the Privilege of Parliament as the demanding of 5 members? But I shall talk treason by and by, if I do not look to myself' (p. 80).

Oliver Cromwell rules by the fiat of the saints and his own good sword ; but the Protector, almost omnipotent abroad, has but unwilling submission at home. Plots smoulder, scandals are rife, and beneath the iron Puritan despotism the passion and play of human frailty wears but a thin disguise.

It is more interesting to pass from generalities to particulars. We will let Dorothy describe in her own language what country life in England was in the year of grace 1653.

' You ask me how I pass my time here. I can give you a perfect account, not only of what I do for the present, but of what I am likely to do this seven years if I stay here so long. I rise in the morning reasonably early, and before I am ready I go round the house till I am weary of that, and then into the garden till it grows too hot for me. About ten o'clock I think of making me ready, and when that's done I go into my father's chamber, from whence to dinner, where my cousin Molle and I sit in great state in a room, and at a table that would hold a great many more. After dinner we sit and talk till Mr. B. comes in question, and then I am gone. The rest of the day is spent in reading or working, and about six or seven o'clock I walk out into a common that lies hard by the house, where a great many young wenches keep sheep and cows, and sit in the shade singing of ballads. I go to them, and compare their voices and beauties to some ancient shepherdesses that I have read of, and find a vast difference there ; but, trust me, I think these are as innocent as those could be. I talk to them, and find they want nothing to make them the happiest people in the world but the knowledge that they are so. Most commonly, when we are in the midst of our discourse, one looks about her, and spies her cows going into the corn, and then away they all run as if they had wings at their heels. I, that am not so nimble, stay behind ; and when I see them driving home their cattle, I think 'tis time for me to return too. When I have supped I go into the garden, and so to the side of a small river that runs by it, when I sit down and wish you were with me (you had best say this is not kind neither). In earnest, 'tis a pleasant place, and would be much more so to me if I had your company. I sit there sometimes till I am lost with thinking ; and were it not for some cruel thoughts of the crossness of our fortunes that will not let me sleep there, I should forget that there were such a thing to be done as going to bed' (pp. 100-1).

The pen which could compose so sweet a pastoral was not at fault when very different scenes were to be described. When to truth of nature and sobriety of thought there is added a singular clearness of vision, we are sure that the writer will grasp the essential features of each scene in turn, and will present us with a lifelike picture. A few rapid touches in bold outline sketch out a Puritan sermon at Westminster Abbey.



Amongst the popular preachers of the day, one Stephen Marshall was so far prominent as frequently to preach 'by command' before Parliament at Westminster. That he was a leading spirit among the Westminster divines and a controversialist of no mean repute, may be judged from the fact that his initials stand first in the name 'Smectymnuus,' given in the uncouth phraseology of the time to a famous treatise<sup>1</sup> upon Church government. The style of this doughty champion of Presbyterianism may be gathered from the title of a letter of his published ten years before, for the necessary vindication of him and his ministry, 'against that altogether groundless, most unjust and ungodly aspersion cast upon him by certain malignants in the City, and lately printed at Oxford in their *Mendacium Aulicum*, otherwise called *Mercurius Aulicus*, and sent abroad to his eternal infamy,' &c.—but we must stop before half the prolix title is quoted. Suffice it to say that Smectymnuus elicited a reply from Bishop Hall, and that the great author of the 'Areopagitica' himself mingled in the fray and broke more than one lance in the quarrel. Mr. Parry tells us that such sermons of Marshall's as are still extant abound in prosy, long-winded, dogmatic absurdities, overloaded with periphrastic illustrations in scriptural language. We wonder how many of the audience in the glorious Abbey, so singularly identified with English royalty, listened with such critical ears as Mistress Dorothy, whilst the self-satisfied rhetorician thundered out his platitudes. Hers probably was not the only demure countenance and quiet demeanour beneath which lay concealed the scornful contempt expressed as follows:—

'God forgive me, I was near laughing yesterday where I should not. Would you believe, I had the grace to go hear a sermon upon a week day? In earnest, 'tis true; a Mr. Marshall was the man that preached, but never anybody was so defeated. He is so famed that I expected rare things of him, and seriously I listened to him as if he had been St. Paul; and what do you think he told us? Why, that if there were no kings, no queens, no lords, no ladies, nor gentlemen, nor gentlewomen, in the world, it would be no loss to God Almighty at all. This we had over some forty times, which made me remember it whether I would or not. The rest was much at this rate, interlarded with the prettiest odd phrases, that I had the most ado to look soberly enough for the place I was in that ever I had in my life. He does not preach so always, sure? If he does, I cannot believe his sermons will do much towards bringing anybody to heaven more than by exercising their patience. Yet, I'll say that for him, he stood stoutly for tithes, though, in my opinion, few deserve them less than he; and it may be he would be better without them' (pp. 190-1).

<sup>1</sup> The joint work of five Puritan divines.

A passing glimpse at the behaviour in church, which even so devout a worshipper did not deem unseemly, is afforded by her incidentally mentioning that she had occasion at St. Gregory's 'to look up in the gallery where B. sat, to answer a very civil salute given me from thence by Mr. Freeman, and saw B. in a great whisper with another that sat next him, and pointing to me.'

It was naturally to be expected that the severity of Puritan manners would result in a marked reaction such as set in at the Restoration, and the Letters abound with incidental allusions that show how utterly hollow under the Protectorate was the affectation of superior piety. Scandals were too prevalent, and if the repression of popular pastimes were neither so stern nor so sweeping as has been supposed, the licence of the time was more unblushing for lack of a recognised standard of high breeding. Such testimony as that contained in the following brief extract is unexceptionable, as being intended only for Temple's own perusal, and as evincing no censorious spirit.

'Tis strange to see the folly that possesses the young people of this age, and the liberty they take to themselves. I have the charity to believe they appear very much worse than they are, and that the want of a Court to govern themselves by is in great part the cause of their ruin; though that was no perfect school of virtue, yet Vice there wore her mask, and appeared so unlike herself that she gave no scandal. Such as were really discreet as they seemed to be gave good example, and the eminency of their condition made others strive to imitate them, or at least, they durst not own a contrary course. All who had good principles and inclinations were encouraged in these, and such as had neither were forced to put on a handsome disguise that they might not be out of countenance at themselves' (pp. 235-6).

We have said but little about the progress of the romance to which we are indebted for these vivid sketches of life under the Commonwealth. We should have liked to be favoured with an occasional glimpse at Temple's replies, but these are not, so far as we know, in existence, and they could hardly have added any further beauty to the portrait of herself which Dorothy unconsciously draws. We hope, despite the unflattering character ascribed to him by his enemies, and in part adopted by the lady's brother, that Temple was not unworthy at this period of the true heart she had so unreservedly given him. There are traces of anxiety perhaps in some of her more serious observations. 'I am not of my brother's opinion that you have no religion in you. In earnest, I never took

anything he ever said half so ill, as nothing, sure, is so great an injury. It must suppose one to be a devil in human shape.' Rivals described him as 'the proudest, imperious, insulting, ill-natured man that ever was.' The stars in their courses seemed to present every obstacle to their union. Dorothy's own lack of fortune, the claims of her sick father, the opposition of Sir John Temple, the want of any such employment as might ensure a modest income to her lover, and, hardest of all to bear, the alternate entreaties and angry remonstrances of her brother, all these embittered her life at Chicksands, but all failed to shake her constancy. How resolutely, and at what cost of sorrow, she remained faithful is illustrated by her account of a battle royal with her brother, in which we may well believe that the lady came off victorious.

'I could tell you such a story ('tis too long to be written) as would make you see (what I never discovered in myself before) that I am a valiant lady. In earnest, we have had such a skirmish, and upon so foolish an occasion, as I cannot tell which is strangest. The Emperor<sup>1</sup> and his proposals began it; I talk'd merrily on't till I saw my brother put on his sober face, and could hardly then believe he was in earnest. It seems he was, for when I had spoke freely my meaning, it wrought so with him as to fetch up all that lay on his stomach. All the people that I had ever in my life refused were brought again upon the stage, like Richard the III.'s ghosts, to reproach me withal; and all the kindness his discoveries could make I had for you was laid to my charge. My best qualities (if I have any that are good) served but for aggravations of my fault, and I was allowed to have wit and understanding and discretion in other things, that it might appear I had none in this. Well, 'twas a pretty lecture, and I grew warm with it after a while; in short, we came so near an absolute falling out, that 'twas time to give over, and we said so much then that we have hardly spoken a word together since. But 'tis wonderful to see what curtsies and legs pass between us; and as before we were thought the kindest brother and sister, we are certainly the most complimentary couple in England. 'Tis a strange change, and I am very sorry for it, but I'll swear I know not how to help it. I look upon 't as one of my great misfortunes, and I must bear it, as that which is not my first nor likely to be my last' (pp. 112-114).

A far heavier grief was indeed in store for her at no distant date. How the misunderstanding arose between them Mr. Parry cannot clearly explain.

'Alone,' says the editor, 'in the old house with her dying father, and with her brother pouring his unkind gossip into her unwilling,

<sup>1</sup> The nickname of one of Dorothy's suitors.

ear, whilst the sad, long year draws slowly to its close, and there is no sign of better fortune for the lovers—can we wonder that Dorothy . . . lost faith and hope?' (p. 198).

A sense of despair settled upon her, and her marriage to Temple seemed so impossible that she determined to abandon further thought of it, and to release Temple from his plighted troth. This unhappy episode is comprised in a separate chapter of the correspondence, whose mournful tone contrasts sadly with the buoyancy hitherto so bravely sustained.

In estimating the character of these letters it must be borne in mind that the writer is twenty-six years old, for some time motherless, and almost alone save for the companionship of her father, a confirmed valetudinarian. She has few of the literary resources, on which to form her style, such as now abound in every country house. She is reduced to despair by the fierce opposition of a brother whom she loves fondly—only less fondly than the lover whose passionate reproaches and violent expressions of grief are wounding her to the quick. She has fallen into such utter despair of a favourable issue to her love that she is determined to set Temple free from his plighted troth. It is under these conditions that the letters gathered into a chapter entitled 'Despondency' were penned, and we confidently ask whether, for felicity of expression, for simple dignity of thought, for genuine piety and pathos and resignation, it were easy to surpass them. Let the reader determine from the following, which, although we quote it *in extenso*, is hardly more striking than others written at this same unhappy crisis:—

'SIR,—That which I writ by your boy was in so much haste and distraction as I cannot be satisfied with it, nor believe it has expressed my thoughts as I meant them. No, I find it is not easily done at more leisure, and I am yet to seek what to say that is not too little nor too much. I would fain let you see that I am extremely sensible of your affliction, that I would lay down my life to redeem you from it, but that's a mean expression; my life is of so little value that I will not mention it. No; let it be rather what, in earnest, if I can tell anything I have left that is considerable enough to expose for it, it must be that small reputation I have amongst my friends; that's all my wealth, and that I could part with to restore you to that quiet you lived in when I first knew you. But, on the other side, I would not give you hopes of that I cannot do. If I loved you less I would allow you to be the same person to me, and I would be the same to you as heretofore. But to deal freely with you, that were to betray myself, and I find that my passion would quickly be my master again if I gave it any liberty. I am not secure that it would not make me do the most extravagant things in the world, and I shall be forced to

keep a continual war alive with it as long as there are any remainders of it left—I think I might as well have said as long as I lived. Why should you give yourself over so unreasonably to it? Good God! no woman breathing can deserve half the trouble you give yourself. If I were yours from this minute I could not recompense what you have suffered from the violence of your passion, though I were all that you can imagine me, when, God knows, I am an inconsiderable person, born to a thousand misfortunes, which have taken away all sense of anything else from me, and left me a walking misery only. I do from my soul forgive you all the injuries your passion has done me, though, let me tell you, I was much more at my ease whilst I was angry. Scorn and despite would have cured me in some reasonable time, which I despair of now. However, I am not displeased with it, and, if it may be of any advantage to you, I shall not consider myself in it; but let me beg, then, that you will leave off these dismal thoughts. I tremble at the desperate things you say in your letter: for the love of God, consider seriously with yourself what can enter into comparison with the saving of your soul. Are a thousand women, or ten thousand worlds, worth it? No, you cannot have so little reason left as you pretend, nor so little religion. For God's sake, let us not neglect what can only make us happy for trifles. If God had seen it fit to satisfy our desires we should have had them, and everything would not have transpired thus to have crossed them. Since He has decreed it otherwise (at least as far as we are able to judge by events) we must submit, and not by striving make an innocent passion a sin, and show a childish stubbornness.

I would say a thousand things more to this purpose if I were not in haste to send this away, that it may come to you at least as soon as the other. Adieu' (p. 215).

Our readers will see that there is no need to fall back upon the historical interest of these letters, or upon their value as illustrations of the times, in order to enlist their sympathy and admiration. The dark cloud which had so long overshadowed Dorothy's love, and which deepens with its pathetic tones the richness of her utterance, was eventually dispersed, and the concluding letters show the exuberant affection of a loving nature that feels it can now safely give itself without reserve. We had marked many other passages for quotation, but we trust enough has been said to induce the reader to gather for himself further honey from the hive so richly stored. The true depth of a woman's nature is never more clearly displayed than in the letters designed only for the eye of the man whom she loves with all her heart. True love inevitably and unconsciously lays bare the inmost thoughts and intents of its subject. Tested by so trying a standard Dorothy Osborne comes out nobly. The marked characteristic of these letters is a sustained dignity of thought wedded

very commonly to a singular felicity of expression—this latter, be it remembered, being no mean indication of character. *Le style c'est la femme*. The world is richer for this example of a pure-minded woman who knew how to bear herself modestly and Christianly in evil days.

---

#### ART. VIII.—RENAN'S HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

*Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*. Par ERNEST RENAN. Tome premier. (Paris, 1887.)

*History of the People of Israel*. By ERNEST RENAN. Vol. I. (London, 1888.)

M. RENAN is giving us in this book a history of Israel purged from all taint of the supernatural. Providential he admits that history to be, meaning by the word that it has 'its appointed place on a *plan* exalted above the chops and changes of daily life' (preface, p. x). A miraculous character he denies it, for 'everything in the progress of humanity issues from one single principle, at once natural and ideal.' Three miraculous histories (those of Judea, Greece, and Rome), or none, such is the alternative he offers us. The Jewish history, though it claims a monopoly of miracles, is to his mind not a whit more extraordinary than the Greek. Nay, the greatest of historical miracles is Greece herself. The simultaneous appearance in the Greek race of all which constitutes the honour and ornament of human genius impresses him far more than the passage of the Red Sea and the Jordan. We note the unfair comparison between the perfected work of the one race, and episodes in the history of the other, and wonder whether, in M. Renan's opinion, Israel's gifts to humanity equal those of Greece. He does not leave us in doubt. 'Philosophy and science are the two *capital* creations of humanity' (p. 12), and these do not spring from the fount of Israel. It was Greece who 'founded, in the fullest sense of the word, rational and progressive humanity' (p. vii). 'The very centre of the divine egg within which life began to palpitate was Greece' (p. xi). 'Christianity is less certain of duration than Hellenism' (p. ix). 'Human progress consists in executing the designs of Greece' (p. xi). 'The Jewish and Christian histories, though they have



been the delight of eighteen centuries, are now half-vanquished by Greek rationalism' (*ibid.*). 'The Greek history is in some respects a finer history than the Jewish' (p. xv). Though he does not regret 'the Nazarite vow which attached him early in life to the Jewish and Christian problem,' he reckons that man to be supremely happy who, after sixty years of study, shall write the history of the genius of Greece (pp. x, xi).

We cannot wonder that M. Renan should reckon the influence of Greece on the development of humanity to be of higher order and value than that of Israel. Israel is the universal and unrivalled teacher of religion and morals; in the intellectual sphere she takes a subordinate place. On the other hand, as M. Renan himself says, 'Greece had only one thing wanting in the circle of her moral and intellectual activity, but this was an important void; she despised the humble, and she did not feel the need of a just God. Her philosophers were . . . tolerant towards the iniquities of this world' (p. vii). It is no libel on M. Renan to say he has much closer affinities with the philosophers of Greece than with the prophets of Israel. His judgments and estimates of men and things are conceived from the intellectual point of view. He leaves out of his consideration moral and religious principles—or rather, he repudiates them. God is everywhere, say the Hebrew prophets; through Him everything lives, whatever happens is His work. Semitic philosophy, says M. Renan, 'exaggerated beyond measure the intentional intervention of superior forces in the current of human affairs' (p. 42). But 'Greek philosophers saw to perfection as far back as 500 B.C.' (p. 23), and M. Renan sees, too, that no signs have been discovered in nature of any intelligent agent superior to man. 'The summits of Olympus and of Sinai are deserts' (p. xxvii). 'Righteousness,' say the Hebrew prophets, 'establishes a nation and a man; as for the transgressors, they shall perish for ever.' 'Truth beareth away the victory,' was the wise saying put in the mouth of the Jew Zerubbabel by the author of the first book of Esdras. Put beside these such *unmoral*, such cynical, remarks as—'A great man owes as much to his defects as to his good qualities' (p. xv); 'The Jewish intellect derived its strength from its least sympathetic characteristics, from its fanaticism, and from its exclusive tendencies' (*ibid.*); 'The French royalty, the Catholic unity of the Middle Ages, Protestantism, and the Revolution were brought into being by all kinds of crimes and errors' (*ibid.*). That evil has a certain power for destruction of evil, and even of good, is to be freely admitted; that great and good causes

were  
den  
mon  
reck  
stre  
M.  
not

beca  
his  
poi  
sym  
con  
and  
the  
hist  
gion  
ever  
'Ch  
thro  
be  
can  
of,  
relig  
and  
con  
nob  
scie  
sup  
'Pr  
The  
he  
sho  
vici  
whi  
rite  
He  
suc

ject  
ma  
the  
itse  
aut  
illu

were (seemingly at least) advanced by great crimes cannot be denied. But there is something more than this here. Equal moment is assigned to powers of good and evil. Evil is reckoned to have a creative force, and to be a source of strength. In this depreciation of the strength of goodness M. Renan can find support in Greek philosophy; he can find nothing but opposition in the Old Testament teaching.

We have described M. Renan's position at some length because it gives us a key to the methods and conclusions of his book. He has written a history of Israel from the Greek point of view. His studies have been on the Jew, but his sympathies are with the Greek. He does not write his history *con amore*. He has only a historical interest in the nation and the religious movement he chronicles. The downfall of theology does not, as he says, imply the downfall of the history of theology. But the man who holds that 'all religions are vain' (p. 50), that 'in the infinite there is room for everyone to fashion his own romance' (p. xxv), who reckons 'Christian theology with its Bible to have been for the last three centuries the worst enemy of science' (p. 50) (science, be it remembered, is one of the capital creations of humanity), cannot have sufficient enthusiasm for, or interior knowledge of, his subject to treat it with success. After all, theology and religion are the main elements of the history of Israel. Jewish and Christian theology is, according to M. Renan, the Semitic conception of the Supreme Deity—a conception comparatively noble, very superior to the Aryan, but infinitely removed from scientific fact (p. 33). Religion is the offspring of man's superstitious fears in the days of his childhood. The adage, 'Primus in orbe deos fecit timor,' is admirably true (p. 24). The ideal historian should not be a partisan, we admit, but he should not be a partisan against his own subject. He should be able to sympathize a little with its heroes in their vicissitudes. He should have some little respect for the results which they achieved. It seems to us a pity that 'the Nazarenes' vow' withdrew M. Renan from a more congenial work. He would have been much happier, he would have been more successful, in writing a history of Greece.

And if M. Renan was unfortunate in the choice of a subject, his misfortunes were intensified by the character of the material with which he had to deal. For the history of Israel there is only one substantial authority—the Old Testament itself. That book stands alone amongst books, the only authority for the events it relates. Its narratives may be illustrated by ancient monuments, its chronology verified or

corrected by the Assyrian Eponyms, its accounts of the Creation and the Flood profitably compared with the Babylonian mythology, its institutions traced to the influence and example of Egypt. Notwithstanding, it contains the only chronicle of the substantial events of Israel's history. The period of the fall of the northern kingdom is the earliest and the only period of Old Testament history on which the secular records give considerable information.

M. Renan must needs derive the materials of his history from the Old Testament, and he has a most difficult task before him. It is possible to regard Israel in two different ways. She is either a nation by herself, holy and separate, God's peculiar people, the recipient of His teaching, the medium of His revelation; or she is one of the nations, and as one of them, with her own characteristics no doubt, but not essentially different from them. Israel's own historians, who, it will be remembered, are reckoned by the Jewish people amongst the prophets, regard her exclusively from the former, M. Renan exclusively from the latter point of view. He has thus to compile his history without miracle, without God, from narratives in which miracles are the framework of the narrative, and in which God is everywhere.

Israel's divine vocation is a fact which so fills the minds of the Old Testament writers that there is room for nothing else. The material causes which brought about the rise and fall of kingdoms are passed over unnoticed. Their one idea is that God ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever He will. This 'Theocratic Pragmatism' of the prophetic historians destroys to a considerable extent the value of their history from a scientific point of view. The Old Testament is not a scientific history; and what is more, a scientific history cannot be made out of it. The silences of Israel's history are eloquent to the theologian, but they are simply provoking to the scientific historian. It has been said that 'Israel has throughout no history except in as far as it is the organ of revelation.'<sup>1</sup> How imperfect, how misleading, how chaotic must its history be in the eyes of one who disbelieves in all revelation; and yet from it all his materials have to be derived.

To do M. Renan justice, he grapples with his difficulties boldly. The historical untrustworthiness of the Old Testament is to him a demonstrated fact. 'There are no (material) facts . . . in the history of Israel up to the time of David' (p. xvi). The statement is sweeping enough. He clears away

<sup>1</sup> Oehler's *O. T. Theology*, vol. i. p. 99.

the c  
afres  
to m  
mat  
truth  
Judg  
to th  
and  
neve  
for t  
of t  
time

help  
solv  
mai  
hin  
leac  
the  
ofte  
gra  
(p.  
the  
imp  
ritic  
wit  
wh  
on  
dis  
nee

is  
rej  
in  
No  
mu  
is  
tra  
(p.  
wh  
tw  
str  
wa  
ste  
th

the old building to its foundations before he begins to build afresh, and he makes no attempt to build on the old lines or to modify the old plans. He throws away most of the old materials as rubbish, and combines the small remainder of truth in a fashion of his own. The Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel are tales, legends, romances, similar to the Homeric poems, the Arab tales of the ante-Islam period, and the Arthurian romances of the middle ages. It is possible, nevertheless, to learn a good deal about this legendary period, for 'legends are marvellously instructive as regards the colour of the periods to which they belong and the habits of the time' (p. xvi).

There are, M. Renan thinks, two special features, one a help, one a hindrance, in the historical problem he has to solve. The special help is that patriarchal life survives in its main features to our own day among Arab tribes. The hindrance is, 'The ancient texts seem expressly designed to lead us astray. The old epic tales, trustworthy in their way, the theocratic after-touches, and the sacerdotal revisions are often to be met with, one upon another, in the same paragraph; and it needs a very practised eye to detect them' (p. xxi). 'In the historical parts of the Bible the scissors of the compilers have been plied so capriciously that it is often impossible to make any attempt to sort the different authorities' (*ibid.*). M. Renan, it should be noted, agrees generally with the conclusions arrived at by the school of Reuss, of whom Kuenen and Wellhausen are best known in England, on the composition of the Old Testament. He reserves the discussion of those conclusions to his second volume, and they need not be examined by us here.

In his use of the critical conclusions he assumes, M. Renan is independent and interesting. His hand is free either to reject, or to insist on as typical and customary, every incident in the narratives of the earlier Old Testament history. Nothing is authentic and genuine in these narratives, but much is true to life. He decides for us what is true and what is false. He is far from rejecting everything. On the contrary, the colour of the (legendary) narratives is truth itself (p. 96). Any detail of the narrative is sufficient evidence on which to found a custom. For example, he tells us that when twins were born the midwife took care to tie a bit of red string round the arm of the firstborn (p. 16); and that Bethel was regarded as the foot of a vast staircase or pyramid with steps which ascended from earth to heaven (p. 99). More than this, the narrators, one and all, pictured patriarchal life

and thought with remarkable accuracy. The present Deity we find in the pages of Genesis existed, not indeed in reality, but in the patriarchal imaginations (pp. 23, 25, 27). God's voice was not heard by them, but they fancied they heard it (p. 49). 'Thou God seest me' is a true expression of the patriarchal belief.

But though M. Renan insists upon the details as certain and typical, though the beliefs of the patriarchs are correctly described, the patriarchs themselves are mythical personages, and all those acts which show God's love and embody His revelation to man, are figments of the prophetic imagination. The Father of the faithful is the imaginary ancestor of the Semitic tribes (p. 22), and the history of Jacob is a 'master-piece of ethnographical psychology' (p. 21 *n*). Moses is completely buried by the legends which have grown up over him (p. 135). The Levites were Egyptians by race, they were called sons of the ark (Heb. Aron) because they bore it; and after a while the ark was personified into Aaron, the brother of the legend-buried Moses (pp. 127, 153). The name of Joshua can only be used in an historical narrative with the utmost precaution (p. 155), and the life of Samuel is known to us by little else than legendary documents (p. 308). David was an unscrupulous bandit whom the opinion of humanity has crowned with every kind of halo (pp. 331, 362).

And so we see in Israel's earlier history every fact is doubtful, every person is mythical, but every detail is certain. M. Renan takes us by the hand and places us before the cherished picture—the picture of the Divine dealings with the race—the heirloom of many generations, the treasure of every Christian family—and, with a cold smile on his face, he brands it as a palpable forgery. But console yourself, he goes on to say: the colouring is perfect, the details are true, the framing is beyond all price. You have not in the books of the Old Testament a record of God's dealings with the race. As a matter of fact, God, if there be a God, never interferes in human affairs. You have, however, an exact picture of the patriarch's conceptions of the imaginary dealings with them of their imaginary God. You will find, scattered here and there, fragments of historical truth, which it is possible to piece together into a rational and scientific history of Israel, and you have a mine of archæological lore.

Now, have we here a theory which has even the remotest pretence to verisimilitude? We must bear in mind how the patriarchal history is supposed to have been framed. M. Renan finds at least three original versions of the Pentateuch (p. xxii).

Those versions were based in part on ancient documents, and embodied the traditions of many minds and of many ages. The old epic tales, trustworthy in their way, were subjected to 'theocratic after-touches and sacerdotal revisions,' and the manipulators and revisers were not single individuals but many. And yet—marvellous result!—this composition of heterogeneous materials is a perfect whole, and it needs the critic's practised eye to discern the joinings (p. xxi). This work of many ages and many minds has a unity of its own. This mosaic of narratives which have no substantial foundation of fact describes with essential truth patriarchal life and patriarchal thought (p. 12). A task beyond the powers of a single mind with all the resources of civilization at his command, was, it appears, accomplished, without thought or concert or effort, by a number of men who had no libraries or even books to consult. As a narrative of God's dealings with men, Genesis is found to be worthless; to the scientific historian it is full of value. M. Renan, to whom all religions are vain, but to whom the history of religion is full of interest (pp. xxvi, xxvii), is fortunate beyond all reasonable expectation. What is valuable in his eyes is true, what is worthless is false. Can it be that his wishes and prejudices have determined his conclusions?

The Hebrew prophets and M. Renan are, we see, diametrically opposed in fundamental ideas, methods, aims, and results, but we must guard ourselves from being supposed to admit there is anything in the view the prophets take of history contrary to, or inconsistent with, the view of the scientific historian. They are 'provokingly incomplete' as we have said, but this is the worst that can be alleged against them. If the general proposition can be maintained, that religion and science, or rather true religion and true science, are not and cannot be contrary the one to the other, the particular instance, there is no opposition between religious and scientific history, cannot be gainsaid. The religious and the scientific historians work on the same materials, but they attach primary importance to different elements. The one concerns himself with causes professedly above and beyond this world. The other never passes this world's limits. The one need not, however, be antagonistic to the other. The two sets of causes may be related like cause and effect, or may work harmoniously together. The Assyrian may be the rod of God's anger; Cyrus, His shepherd who performs all His will; the winter of abnormal cold—the destruction of a tyrant's power—God's special ordering. According to the Old



Testament narratives, Israel was under special supernatural influences, yet Israel, following the same narratives, was no hothouse plant; her development was not forced and unnatural, but gradual, natural, and free. Though the people of God, she was none the less a nation of the earth. The natural order was not overthrown, though a higher order was established. God's special dealings fitted in and worked along with the ordinary laws of nature and providence.

But M. Renan will not have it so. 'It has never been discovered,' he says, 'that a superior being concerns himself with events either of the physical or moral order' (p. 34). The Old Testament writers ignore the natural causes which are to him everything. He goes further and denies the existence of the supernatural causes of which their minds are full. This being so he is bound to give us a natural explanation of the people of Israel. He must tell us, not indeed 'how things happened'—that would be too much to expect—but 'how things might have happened' (p. xvii). Moreover, he must give us a plausible explanation, not only of things, but also of the Thing—of Israel herself, not simply of facts in her history. To adopt M. Renan's own words, 'In our opinion the greatest miracle on record (of the Old Testament times) is Israel herself. The gradual appearance in her of all the truths which nourish and develop the highest elements of human nature, impresses us far more than the passage of the Red Sea or of the Jordan' (p. x). M. Renan cannot from his position, as we have seen, adequately value Israel's work for humanity, but yet he is not without substantial appreciation of her marvellous gifts. He says, 'The Bible is, whatever may be said, humanity's great book of consolation' (p. xi). And 'The Jewish and Christian histories have been the delight of eighteen centuries, and are extraordinarily effective in the amelioration of morals' (*ibid.*). And again, 'It is by no means impossible the world will once more become Jewish and Christian' (*ibid.*). He thus admits facts of the greatest importance, results for which he has to give us rational and natural explanations. How is it that the influence of Israel, a little one amongst the nations, despised and disliked, makes so powerfully for justice and goodness, and has been so permanent and useful? A quasi-eternal power making for good everywhere! We seem to have some superhuman characteristics here. It is not a little thing which M. Renan has to explain. Let us see what his explanation is.

In the first volume of his *Peuple d'Israel*, to which this notice is confined, M. Renan describes the origin of Israel. His description is interesting and important, for he recognizes,

which  
the  
'No  
refer  
relig  
scar  
tion  
53).  
mor  
(*ibid.*  
Isra  
a m  
orig  
suff  
exp

wan  
carr  
func  
mos  
a li  
spiri  
assu  
exp  
men

Sen  
is M  
in C  
tent  
nee  
gres  
with  
pro  
law  
cep  
idea  
It v  
no  
cha  
som  
lead  
and  
the  
was  
(p.

which some of the critical school do not, that it was during the patriarchal age the destiny of Israel began to be written. 'Nothing in the history of Israel can be explained without reference to the patriarchal age' (p. xiii): 'Israel's great religious movement, which swept the world along with it, has scarcely begun, but the greater prophets made the reconstitution of the patriarchal state the object of their work' (pp. 52, 53). 'The march towards Monotheism was in reality nothing more than a return to the intuition of their early history' (*ibid.*). 'In the stories of patriarchal life the children of Israel were not creating a myth, but they were rather recalling a memory' (*ibid.*). The importance of the period of Israel's origin is thus fully recognized by M. Renan. It solely and sufficiently explains Israel's after-history. How is it itself explained? M. Renan says—

'Arabia and Syria were (in the centuries after 2000 B.C.) full of wandering families [of Semitic race], who lived in tents, and who carried about with them the secrets of their fine language, and of the fundamental ideas of their race. Tent life is that which gives the most opportunity and spare time for reflection and passion. It was a life of this kind, austere and stately, which created one of the spirits of humanity, one of the forms through which the genius which assumes bodily shape by our nerves and muscles, developed into expression and life. Judaism (of which Christianity is but a development) and Islamism have their roots in this ancient soil' (p. 11).

**TENT LIFE!** So this is the secret of the power of the Semitic race on humanity! Yes, there is no doubt that such is M. Renan's opinion. He tells us that the fixed settlement in Canaan was a degradation and a religious decadence, that tent life was in later times a lofty ideal, a sort of magnetic needle to which Israel will constantly gravitate (p. 93). Progress will be a return to the conditions of tent life. Tent life, with its religion and virtues and social conditions, will be the programme of the prophets and the Utopia of the Mosaic law (pp. 52, 53). Authors of sacred books will find their conception of religious perfection in tent life. Moreover, this ideal was not, as often in the history of nations, a chimera. It was a memory of lost purity and happiness (exaggerated, no doubt), but one which had left an indelible trace upon the character of the nation. It was an ideal actually realized by some of the tribes, and by those individuals who desired to lead the higher religious life. Finally, tent life made the men and the movement which destroyed paganism and converted the world to monotheism. The tent of the Semite patriarch was the starting-point of the religious progress of humanity (p. 36).

M. Renan deprives us of the simple, truth-like, natural, though supernatural, explanation of the origin of Israel which we find in the pages of Genesis. Divine voice, Divine hand, Divine teaching, Divine providence, he relegates to the region of childish dreams. That is a very easy task for him; but he has some remarkable historical facts beyond all contradiction to explain rationally, and then his difficulties begin. We want to know where the Semites got their 'fine' language and the fundamental ideas of their race. The Semites have these already when he introduces us to them. The chief of these fundamental ideas is, as he tells us, the supremacy of one common master in heaven and earth (p. 38). This idea was in the germ from the very first, though it remained vague and confused up to the ninth century B.C. It will be noticed we have here not one God simply, but one present God, one Ruler and Master, one Providence. How did the Semites get hold of this great truth? It is no explanation to say that nomads are not fond of paintings and sculptures, and that it is inconvenient for them to carry about idols with them in their journeyings (p. 38). It is no explanation to point out that the Semitic language does not lend itself to personifications, and is incapable of giving truth to a mythology (p. 40). We want to know why the language has this characteristic. As M. Renan most truly says: 'It is not merely the expression, but the train of thought itself which is profoundly monotheistic' (p. 41). The thought came before the language. The language was the expression of the thoughts of a monotheistic people. How did they conceive the thoughts?

Is tent life a reasonable explanation? A life of leisure and comparative solitude may be at times a life for brooding over and developing great ideas. As a rule we believe it is just the contrary. It is busy men who think most; great ideas are developed in active life and in controversy, in the places where men of different minds meet. As iron sharpens iron, so the minds of men sharpen one another by contact. There is more thinking in the towns than in the country. It is quite true that nomad or country life preserves noble characteristics and good old customs, but quite another rôle is assigned it here. It conceives, brings forth to the light of day, fundamentally new ideas of religion and morality. The type of character developed by nomad life, we are told, was the staid, well-born, well-bred, very courteous aristocrat, who took a very serious view of life, avoided all contact with rough and coarse people, maintained his own rights, and respected the rights of others (p. 21)—in one word, the country gentleman.

T  
cernon  
No  
its  
Mo  
sou  
dev  
the  
wou  
mig  
and  
syst  
par  
her  
Mic  
Isra  
find  
cha  
find  
factelen  
alwa  
trib  
sert  
in t  
bret  
thos  
agai  
age  
tent  
The  
to b  
expeI  
earth  
Isra  
Isra  
myth  
thing  
and  
have  
posse  
VO

The country gentleman has his great gifts, but his genius is certainly not of the creative type.

Moreover, this theory fails to differentiate between Semite nomads generally and the children of Israel in particular. Nothing is more remarkable than the unlikeness of Israel in its character, destiny, and importance to the cognate tribes of Moab, Edom, and Arabia. They all sprang from the same source, they spoke cognate languages, their national life was developed under similar natural conditions. In many respects the difference between an Israelite and a Moabite or Edomite would not be worth considering, and yet Israel is to this day mighty in the hearts and minds of men, and Moab and Edom and the like are remembered only in connexion with her. A systematic and religious attachment to nomad life on Israel's part would not, as M. Renan seems to suggest, account for her superiority. If so, the permanent Semitic nomads, the Midianites, Amalekites, and Arabs, would have surpassed Israel. Are we to find the secret in Israel's prophets, let us first find the secret of Israel's prophets. In the divine origin and character of Israel's religion, M. Renan will not permit us to find the explanation. So doing, he leaves a most important fact unexplained.

Again, M. Renan asserts that in Israel herself the nomad element was superior to the settled. Israel, we are told, had always before her an example of primitive purity in her nomad tribes (p. 53). Now is there the semblance of a reason for asserting that the tribes east of Jordan, or the tribe of Simeon in the south, were purer in religion and morals than their brethren of Ephraim or Judah, or that from them came forth those prophets who were Israel's great reformers? Once again, Was Israel's ideal in the past? Was not her golden age in the future? Was it a restoration of the patriarchal tents? Was it not rather an establishment of David's throne? The theory of tent life, as propounded by M. Renan, seems to break down everywhere. It is opposed alike to reason, experience, and history.

Besides the doctrine of one supreme ruler in heaven and earth, there is another fundamental element of the religion of Israel on which tent life had an important influence, viz. Israel's doctrine of Creation. 'Mankind, disgusted with mythology, wanted a seeming explanation of the origin of things, a cosmogony with an air of being reasonable, positive, and historical' (p. 66). The first twelve chapters of Genesis have supplied the void. 'Humanity has supposed that it possessed in them an historical narrative of the things about

which it was most anxious to know—its infancy and early progress' (*ibid.*). What are they in fact? M. Renan tells us that at Babylon there was an abundance of literature which claimed to relate the origin of the world and of humanity. It was not a mere simple mythology; it betrayed a glimmering of scientific hypotheses, starting from accurate and correct observations, generalizing in some cases with singular good sense (p. 58). The Hebrew nomads came in contact with this at Charran, 'a city of syncretism, in which the myths of Babylonian origin underwent all kinds of transformations' (p. 62). They simplified these ancient fables, flattened them down, so to speak, and reduced them to dimensions which admitted of their being carried about with the baggage of the nomad' (p. 65). It will be remembered the same travelling exigencies made idolatry inconvenient to the nomad, and so largely helped to establish monotheism. 'Boiled down,' says M. Renan, 'strapped tight, if I may so express myself, upon the back of the nomad's beast of burden, diluted for centuries in memoirs without any sort of precision and mercilessly condensed, the proto-Chaldean narratives have given us the first chapters of Genesis' (p. 66). Here, then, is the full and complete rational explanation of the Hebrew cosmogony. The narrative in Genesis is the simplification of the Chaldean cosmogony by the Semitic genius, and the secret of Semitic genius is the exigencies of tent life. Is it possible that M. Renan is serious here?

M. Renan's rational account of the development of religion in Israel must not be passed over by us. It involves him in conflict with his authorities; it lays up in store for his future volumes insuperable difficulties. The religion of the Semitic patriarchs finds favour in his eyes. As compared with the primitive Aryan religion and of Israel herself till the days of the canonical prophets, it has many points of superiority (pp. 33, 53). Such were its doctrine of one Supreme Master of the world (p. 38); its connexion of religion with morality (p. 12); the comparative absence of idolatry or gross superstitions of sorcery (p. 34); above all its simple, vague, unsystematic character. The deity had no name, no personal attributes, no individuality of his (or their) own. The Semites imagined a spiritual environment to the world rather than personal gods (pp. 25, 71). The Elohim were not national, local, partial, but universal, ruling over and caring for all alike (pp. 27, 28, 29, 72).

But the definite, organized religion of Israel, from Moses to the canonical prophets, that is an abomination in his eyes.

Its  
caus  
(p. 1  
'the  
days  
patri  
prote  
in Ju  
with  
a spe  
imme  
remo  
name  
'Jahv  
to a l  
in the  
shipp  
there  
was a  
ing t  
under  
(pp. 2  
or con  
of hi  
(pp. 2  
some  
or the  
(pp. 1  
of blo  
sacrifi  
to him  
conde  
nation  
Jahvel  
'It re  
hate e  
all, sup  
Semit  
sacrile  
the po  
his wo  
the w  
special  
cruel,  
of mo

Its initial rite was a 'great historical blunder which nearly caused Israel to lose her providential function in the world' (p. 108). The main element of her worship, viz. sacrifice, was 'the oldest, most serious, error bequeathed to us from the days of man's youthful folly—a revolting absurdity which the patriarchs could not shake off, and against which the prophets protested in vain (p. 44).' But the most abominable element in Judaism is Jahvehism. Jahvehism is the worship of a deity with personality, with a personal name, with attributes, with a special favour and care for Israel (pp. 72, 147). 'It was an immense advantage when the gods had only a generic name, removing all idea of personality' (p. 71). 'A distinctive name is the very negation of the divine essence' (p. 22). 'Jahveh was a political slaughterer, a god who showed favour to a little tribe *per fas et nefas*. Every crime was perpetrated in the name of Jahveh' (p. 220). He was a god who was worshipped by means of idols—calves, serpents, ephods (p. 224); there had been no images of Elohim (p. 152). In form he was a kind of dragon, roaring thunder, vomiting flame, causing the tempest to howl; he was the universal *rouah* (spirit) under a globated form, a kind of condensed electric mass (pp. 238, 239). His will was ascertained, by throwing dice, or concealed springs worked by priests, which turned the face of his image towards or averted it from the worshippers (pp. 228, 229). In character he was hard and exact, quarrelsome and jealous (pp. 236, 260); he met men in the deserts, or the mountains, wrestled with them, attempted to kill them (pp. 160, 239); he was ferocious when robbed of the quantity of blood due to him (pp. 53, 150); he delighted in human sacrifices, and commanded his people to sacrifice their children to him as a punishment (p. 240). 'Patriarchal deism had condemned these immolations; Jahvehism, with its exclusive, national principle, was rather favourable to them' (p. 277). Jahveh had scarcely anything of the moral God about him. 'It required centuries of progress for him to love good, to hate evil, and to become a universal god. He was little, if at all, superior to Chemosh and Moloch, the gods of neighbouring Semitic nations' (pp. 72, 150). 'He was the confiscation, sacrilegious assuredly, though to a certain extent logical, of the power of Elohim to the profit of Israel' (p. 22). Happily, his worship was only a passing error on Israel's part. It was the work of those terrible abolitionists, the prophets (and specially Jesus, the last of them), to *destroy* in detail this cruel, partial, and rancorous Jahveh, and to return, by a series of more and more vigorous efforts, to the primitive Elohimism.



'The history of Israel may be summed up in a word: it was an effort, continued through long ages, to shake off the false god Jahveh, and return to the primitive Elohim' (p. 22). The prophets retained the name Jahveh for a while, but in course of time that too died out. It is to Elohim, not Jahveh, the world has been converted. Neither Christianity nor Judaism knows Jahveh. Christian usage is tantamount to an admission that Jahveh no longer exists (pp. 72, 150).

This sounds, and is, very horrible; but, in justice to M. Renan, we must remember his fundamental principle of theology. For the statement in Genesis, 'God created man in His own image,' he substitutes 'Man created a divine world in his own image' (p. 23). A national God, as he reckons Jahveh to be, is identified with his nation. 'He is in some sense the *alter ego*, the genius of the nation personified, the spirit of the nation in the sense applied by savages to the word' (p. 219). Thus, when he says that the prophets destroyed Jahveh, he is referring to a god which less enlightened Israelites of former days had made; when he asserts that Jahveh is a cruel, jealous, and unjust god, he only means that he is the god of a cruel, jealous, and unjust people.

But now let us put M. Renan's facts and his theory side by side. For his facts he has one authority—the Old Testament. There are two important points in his theory: (1) That the religion of Israel before the prophets was of a low and degraded condition; (2) that the prophets sought to abolish the religion of their ancestors for generations and to return to the religion of the patriarchs.

For (1) M. Renan can, by adopting certain methods, produce a considerable body of evidence. Whenever he finds incidents or statements which witness to the existence of low material conceptions of God in Israel he can lay stress upon them. On the other hand, anything that is noble or lofty in morality or religion he can assign to a later age. Turning poetry into prose he can assert that Jehovah was conceived to be a being with eagle's feathers and with a Medusa-like head (pp. 160, 161). Turning narrative into myth he can cancel all spiritual teaching. If his evidence be still scanty he can remark that 'the Puritans of a later age suppressed whatever part of the text appeared to them too scandalous' (p. 223). The general drift, the whole tenor of the narrative, he can neglect, whilst he can make much of single sentences and texts of doubtful meaning. With such methods he has no difficulty in making a case. It is to be freely confessed that there were many in Israel who had formed low and material

conc  
whic  
expr  
capa  
But  
of Is  
at al  
Lord  
the p  
times  
M. R  
bore  
'We  
into  
(p. 3  
gious  
junct  
M  
invol  
Israe  
Mülle  
pecul  
God,  
(the  
toresh  
God l  
wond  
Israe  
—hov  
they l  
vived  
devel  
of 'p  
writte  
turn f  
sixtee  
in itse  
notion  
in its  
hidden  
far m  
Can w  
patria

conceptions of their God. The phrase 'Our God,' against which M. Renan is so angry and sarcastic (p. 220), but which expresses nevertheless a truth of the highest importance, is capable of terrible perversion, and Israel often perverted it. But are these carnally-minded Israelites the true exponents of Israel's religion at any time in her history? They existed at all times—in the days of the prophets, in the days of our Lord, as in the beginnings of the national history. It is to the prophets we go to learn Israel's true religion in prophetic times. Were there in those earlier days no Israelites indeed? M. Renan denies their existence. The 'first saints of Jahveh bore no reputation for moral purity or real piety' (p. 227). 'We do not learn that Samuel introduced the slightest change into the state of religious affairs which he found established' (p. 311). 'The primitive nomad was more advanced in religious matters than David and Omri' (p. 53) (mark the conjunction).

M. Renan by his pessimistic estimate of Israel's history involves himself in the greatest difficulties, for he destroys Israel's natural development. 'It was,' says Professor Max Müller, 'the worship of Jehovah which made the Jews a peculiar people, the people of Jehovah, separated by their God, though not by their language, from the people of Chemosh (the Moabites) and from the worshippers of Baal and Ash-toreth.'<sup>1</sup> But how could the worship of the cruel Jahveh—the God little, if at all, superior to Chemosh or Baal—effect this wonderful creation? And yet, if it was not Jahveh who made Israel a nation, who or what was it? And Israel's prophets—how shall we account for them? On M. Renan's theory they have no spiritual fathers. The prophets, we are told, revived the memory of the patriarchal religion, and defended and developed patriarchal principles. But how did their knowledge of 'primitive Elohimism' come to them? M. Renan gives no written record to which they could appeal for authority or turn for guidance, as in the reformations of Josiah and the sixteenth century A.D. Patriarchal religion was a vague thing in itself. What is more, the prophets must have had vague notions what it really was. For though it may have lingered in its purity amongst the nomad families and tribes, it was hidden from men's knowledge by the lapse of centuries, and far more by the corruptions of many generations. We ask, Can we find in this vague, forgotten, corrupted religion of the patriarchs a standpoint wide enough and firm enough for the

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on the Science of Religion*, p. 86.

prophets' work? If it is the prophets who account for Israel's greatness, the prophets themselves remain unaccounted for.

(2) M. Renan's description of the prophets' relation to the religion of Israel before their times seems quite contrary to the facts of the case. The prophets, he says, expelled Jahvehism and restored primitive Elohimism. Why then do they so rarely call themselves prophets of Elohim? Why do they invariably assert that it is Jahveh who sends them, the word of Jahveh which they speak? M. Renan supposes they found themselves obliged to retain the word Jahveh whilst they abolished Jahvehism. But to retain a name and at the same time to abolish all that it has typified and represented is, under any circumstances, most difficult, and was impossible in times when names and things had the closest connexion. We know what the prophets did in a cognate case. To abolish Baal worship they proscribed the word Baal (*Hosea* ii. 16, 17). Had they wished to abolish Jahvehism they would have taken a similar course. Their special attachment to the word Jahveh implied their special attachment to the religion of Jahveh.

Not less unreasonable is the inference which M. Renan draws from the disuse of the name Jahveh as a spoken word by Jew and Christian alike. The evidence abundantly shows that it was not half-unconscious dislike, but the deepest religious reverence which debarred the Jew from taking the name Jahveh upon his lips. Various causes—its distinctively Hebrew character, its lost pronunciation, the influence of the Septuagint, the use of another personal name, 'The human name of God above'—have led to the comparative disuse of the word Jahveh by Christians. But though Jew and Christian have ceased to make common use of the word, the doctrine which the word implies (or by ancient tradition is said to imply) is stamped on Jewish and Christian theology. That God's name is I AM, has been a safeguard against many unworthy doctrines of Deity. It has separated God from creation and all created things.

Of all M. Renan's marvellous statements, the most marvellous seems to be that Jahvehism was favourable to human sacrifices, which patriarchal Elohimism had condemned (*p.* 277). He even alleges a passage from the prophets (*Ezek.* xx. 26) to prove that Jahveh had, to punish His people, commanded them to sacrifice their children (*p.* 150). The meaning of this passage is obscure, but M. Renan's interpretation makes *Ezekiel* contradict himself and all other prophets. M. Renan thinks that the daughter of Jephthah was probably not the only

victi  
in th  
insta  
teuch  
for M  
his s  
to w

V  
give  
diffi  
ing  
not  
Con  
qual  
teach  
are  
truth  
inter  
prob

the  
belie  
be fi  
man  
more  
scep  
certa  
it no  
on v  
igno  
The  
of E  
is va  
say  
pass  
say  
and  
esse  
spira  
may  
deta  
we c  
be fi  
utter  
men

victim offered up to Jahveh before He became more lenient in the eighth century B.C. (p. 278). It is, at any rate, the only instance which can be found. The one narrative of the Pentateuch (Gen. xxii.) referring to human sacrifice is unfortunate for M. Renan. It was Elohim who tempted Abraham to offer his son; it is Jahveh who interposes to forbid the sacrifice and to whom Abraham offers a ram as a substitute.

We have said enough, we think, to prove that M. Renan gives us little or no real help towards the solution of the difficult problems connected with the history of Israel. Denying as he does that God interferes in human affairs, he does not know the secret of the vicissitudes of Israel's fortunes. Contemptuously indifferent as he is to all religions, he is not qualified to be the historian of the nation which is the religious teacher of the world. Believing as he does that his materials are in utter confusion, that they are a cunning mixture of truth and error, he has too much power in his hands. To all intents and purposes his preconceived opinions as to what is probable and natural create and destroy his facts.

The problems connected with the history of Israel and the composition of the books of the Old Testament will, we believe, occupy men's minds for many a long day. It must be frankly acknowledged that the traditional theory presents many difficulties, which after all may prove to be nothing more than phantoms conjured up by the restlessness of sceptical and the rashness of half-informed minds. This has certainly been the case with the New Testament. Why may it not be so with the Old? No doubt there are many points on which we must be content for the present to confess our ignorance. The history of Israel is admittedly incomplete. The history of the books of the Old Testament up to the days of Ezra is a blank. From Ezra to the coming of our Lord it is vague and unsatisfactory. It may be urged that we cannot say for certain that the text of the different books has not passed through various revisions and recensions, that we cannot say for certain who wrote this or that book. Questions of date and authorship are not, however, necessarily questions of essential importance. They do not necessarily affect the inspiration or canonicity of a book. But to whatever length we may be not indisposed to make concessions on matters of detail, there are some points—substantial points—on which we cannot afford to be indifferent, on which we are bound to be firm, and to make a stand. Some critical conclusions are utterly inconsistent with the respect shown to the Old Testament by our Lord and His Apostles, and so strike a blow at

the very foundations of Christian teaching. Some, again, are based on a denial of God's Providence, the possibility of revelation, miracle, knowledge of future events—in short, of anything supernatural. Some, again, indirectly impugn the moral character of the Old Testament writers, so that they become men by whom it is impossible to believe the Spirit of God spake. It is not uncommon, we fear, for men whose personal faith in the truth of revelation is firm and clear, to dally with theories which are subversive of all faith.

It is our firm conviction that all attacks against the substantial historical truth of the Old Testament narratives have failed. It is our firm conviction, also, that all critical theories based on the denial of the supernatural in Israel's history raise far more difficulties than they explain. In dealing with such theories the duty of the Christian apologist is plain. It is to accept, for purposes of argument, the principles of historical criticism, and to show by them, as we believe it is possible to do, how inadequately the theories explain the undisputed facts. There are two things about which special care is needed. We must not, on the one hand, maintain untenable positions; nor, on the other, surrender old positions in deference to clamour, repeated assertion, or arguments which involve the conclusions of unbelief. M. Renan's book will not do much harm. It startles and disgusts by its flippant contempt for all the truths of religion. Kuenen's and Welhausen's theories are far more dangerous, when they are presented in a veil of religious sentiment and rigged up in exquisite French. When thus disguised, Christian people are ready to forget that they are thoroughly subversive of a belief in revelation. The Old Testament revelation, if those theories be true, is not a record of God's actual dealings and teachings, it is a creation of the mind and spirit of man. We are horrified when M. Renan tells us that mankind make their gods in their own image; let us think twice and thrice before we accept a theory which involves a conclusion hardly less horrible—The Old Testament doctrine of God has little or no basis in historical fact, and is substantially a product of the human imagination.

SOM  
the  
cou  
circ  
Mo  
he  
ena  
reb  
pro  
seen  
the  
title  
Eng  
' 10  
with  
mee  
cere  
read  
from  
ther  
an  
Vav  
with  
thre  
quo  
init  
that  
the

anc  
Vav  
pub  
Ror  
into

## ART. IX.—ENGLISH CEREMONIAL.

1. *Notes on Ceremonial from the Antient English Office Books.*  
Third edition. (London, 1888.)
2. *Transactions of the Saint Paul's Ecclesiological Society.*  
Vol. ii. part iii., 1888. Containing a paper on 'Suggestions for the Ritual of the Communion Service,' by J. T. MICKLETHWAITE, F.S.A. (London, 1888.)

SOME of those, who under the guidance of Dante have made the pilgrimage through the *Città dolente*, may remember encountering a friar, wrapped in flame, in one of the lower circles that overhang the well of the Giants. Guido da Montefeltro is thus punished for the fraudulent counsel that he gave to Boniface VIII. by means of which the Pope was enabled to entice out of their stronghold of Palestrina the rebellious cardinals of the Colonna family. 'Large be your promise, your performance small,' was the advice. And this seems to us to be the counsel that has been acted upon by the editor or compilers of *Notes on Ceremonial*. On the title-page we read: 'Notes on Ceremonial from the Antient English Office Books;' the page after the Preface contains '10 Reasons for striving to preserve the ancient [this time with a c] English Ceremonial;' and throughout the book we meet with the expression of a most edifying horror of 'Italian' ceremonies. Now, how is this promise performed? Let the reader take the book in hand and go through the references from Chapter I. to Chapter X., over a hundred pages, and then tell us the name of the author most frequently quoted as an authority. There will be no doubt as to the answer. Le Vavas seur meets us continually. There is hardly a page without his name. It is not uncommon to find it twice or three times on one page; while on p. 86 Le Vavas seur is quoted six, on p. 87 five, times. Indeed, on p. 178 it is admitted that he is 'largely quoted,' though many may think that the proper place for this admission should have been in the preface, and not here.

Who, then, is this great authority on English ritual in ancient times? Let us try to explain. The title of Le Vavas seur's book is *Cérémonial selon le Rit Romain*; it was published first in 1857, in order to teach French priests the Roman Ceremonial, which had then only just been introduced into France, in accordance with the wishes of Pius IX. There



could be no demand for such a book before the local rites of France were abolished. Until they were destroyed every diocese had its own *Cérémonial* written to explain and amplify, if necessary, the rubrics of the Missal and Breviary. The first words of the 'Avertissement' of Le Vavas seur explain the book's disastrous origin: 'Depuis le moment où la liturgie Romaine a été rétablie en France, un grand nombre d'évêques ont daigné accueillir notre Cérémonial avec bienveillance;' that is, ever since the Romano-Pian Missal had for the first time been imposed on the French dioceses, the bishops had been obliged to look out for some ritual guide for their clergy, who were perfectly ignorant of Roman practices. Accordingly, an Ultramontane was put up to write a book in which no trace of Gallican custom should be found. Root and branch he was to destroy every local usage. We may see the attitude of his mind towards a national practice, perfectly unimportant in itself, in the note to § 108 (6th ed. 1882, t. i. p. 63). He tells us that

'the custom existing in certain churches of the cantors wearing copes at High Mass is contrary to the rules of Liturgy. No author has spoken of it except those who have written upon French customs.' [This statement is false, and made only to show contempt for diocesan usages.] 'At Rome they do not have, as in certain churches in France, clerks wearing copes at High Mass, but only at Vespers.'

The motto of Le Vavas seur is clearly: Follow Rome blindly; and Le Vavas seur has been taken as a guide at every step by one who hopes that his work 'may be some small aid in fostering a loyal English love for the glorious traditions of the Church in this land'; one who further points out 'that if the youths who help us in choir and in the sacristy are taught Italian ceremonial, and trained to refer to Rome in all such difficulties, we can hardly be surprised if in after-days they refer to the same authority for the solution of other difficulties.' Yes, indeed; and *Notes on Ceremonial* will be a book with which an active Roman controversialist will be able to make many points.

What can have been the motive for choosing a purely Ultramontane book as the basis for an English ritual directory? It is not a work highly prized in the Roman Communion itself. It is a popular book, which has rapidly passed through a number of editions. Its chief merit, as against older and more solid works like Gavantus, is, no doubt, that it gives all the last fashions from Rome. Gavantus often tells us the rules of St. Charles Borromeo as to the vestments,

size of altars, and the like. A better book than Le Vavas seur would have been Martinucci's *Manuale Sacrarum Cere-  
moniarum* (6 vols., Rome, 1879-81), though it is not more scientific, for such is not possible when the whole study of ceremonial is limited to an examination of the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

But it would have been no hard matter for an English writer to discover a work with some tincture of the Gallican rites to which appeal might have been made, if such were ever necessary. The Missals of Paris after the Vintimillian Reform in 1738 still contain many of the old rites, and are yet to be had at a moderate price. The edition of the Lyons Missal of 1866 is even now in print, and contains a certain number of the old Lyonesse ceremonies. But, apparently, the editor did not so much want Gallican ceremonies as a book filled with the most fussy little details of ritual, distracting both to those who perform them and to those who behold them; and in this love of minute direction he shows how completely out of sympathy he is with the ancient service. The ancient service gave a certain number of rites, not very detailed, 'meagre directions' (as our editor so loyally calls the rubrics of the Common Prayer), and left a large discretion to the celebrant or full liberty to local customs. With the post-Tridentine reform of 1570 a different spirit made itself dominant. The era of detailed and minute ceremonial set in. If anyone doubt this, let him take an edition of the Pian Missal as it is called (the Roman Missal, published between 1570 and 1600) and compare the *Ritus* printed at the beginning of the book with the rubrics, say of the *Sacerdotale Romanum* of 1554 or the last *Ordines Romani*, printed by Mabillon in the second volume of his *Museum Italicum*. He will perceive at once that he is in a different atmosphere; one is like Gothic, the other is Renaissance. It seems to be agreed that the architecture of our English churches shall be mediæval; and if this be so, surely the ceremonies to be performed in them shall not be later than mediæval. The feeling that an Oratorian function is out of place in a Gothic church, like St. Alban's, Holborn, has determined the architecture of the new church at Clerkenwell. Renaissance ceremonies bring with them Renaissance architecture. As evidence of the simpler character of the mediæval service we may notice that the editor allows (§ 440) that there was no such person as the *ceremoniarius* or master of the ceremonies in England in mediæval times—a significant admission, because without some such officer it would be almost impossible to

carry on the intricate and involved ceremonial that has found favour in the Roman Communion since the Renaissance.

Had the editor really possessed those Gallican leanings which he tells us he entertains, he could hardly have neglected so completely as he has done the stores of ritual knowledge that the Gallican Missals of the last century contain. Indeed, beyond the few notes in §§ 438 and 441, he seems hardly to be aware of their existence. In a book with the aims of *Notes on Ceremonial* we should have expected at every page a reference to the practice of French dioceses, especially of the Norman dioceses. Of their history the editor seems to know nothing. Perhaps he believes that the diocesan rites in France began to be destroyed under the elder Buonaparte. An acquaintance with the *Institutions Liturgiques* of Dom Prosper Guéranger, rabid Ultramontane as he is, would have saved him from such a notion. Guéranger would have told him that it was only after 1841 that the Roman books began to drive out before them the local French diocesan uses. Have the dust and sound caused by that furious controversy as to the lawfulness of the French rites already been forgotten? It is a lasting sign of the ingratitude of the Roman Court that Guéranger should have written as he did, and have died without a cardinal's hat!

Amongst the many irritating and foolish details of this book we may notice two that show a special lack of tact and knowledge. One is the use of the ciborium, the other of the birretta. The ciborium, in the Roman Communion, is a sort of chalice in which the element of bread is consecrated and reserved. In our Church such a vessel was, we think, unknown till within the last twenty years; the practice has, beyond all doubt, been borrowed from Rome. As a rule the paten is ample for its purpose, and in many mediæval pictures the priest may be seen communicating the faithful from the paten.<sup>1</sup> The use of the ciborium is closely connected with the Roman practice of giving Communion out of Mass to those quite able to attend the Eucharistic service; a most undesirable custom and infraction of primitive use; and any attempt to set up such a custom in any part of the Anglican

<sup>1</sup> On p. 130, note y, we read: 'N.B.—The paten should be quite smooth and plain on the upper surface without any engraving or ornament.' Now Mr. W. H. St. John Hope has collected eighty mediæval English patens; he says: 'In the centre of every paten, with but two exceptions, there is engraved a sacred device, which varies' (*Trans. of St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, 1887, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 86).

The same conclusion follows from an examination of the wills and inventories (*Archæological Journal*, 1887, vol. xliii.).

Communion would be most regrettable. The pyx, the vessel in which the Eucharist was formerly reserved in England, was of different shape and different use to the ciborium.

Like ciborium, there is no anglicised name in church life for birretta; and this at once raises a suspicion of the lateness of its introduction. Our editor tells his pupils to use 'a birretta;' but this is as little definite as the 'Catholic pronunciation of Latin.' Each country has its own. If he will take up Bonanni's *Gerarchia Ecclesiastica*, published at Rome in 1720, and look at pp. 155 and 439, he will see Portuguese, Spanish, French, German, and Italian birrettas represented, all different from one another. Which of these does the editor of *Notes on Ceremonial* mean by a birretta? He shows such a pious horror of everything Italian, that we are sure it will not be of Italian shape. And yet we never saw any other shape in an English church where the foolish and indecent custom of putting caps on the head in choir and church prevails. A drawing of the old English cap may be seen in the portrait of Bishop Fisher, lately published by the 'Catholic Truth Society;' and we mention this because we feel sure that if there had been any evidence for the use of the Italian birretta in England at that date, it would have been brought forward. In this portrait the episcopal dress as well as the cap of Bishop Fisher, are nearly the same as those which we see in the portraits of the Caroline bishops of the seventeenth century.

If the priests that houselled our forefathers did wear anything on their heads as they went to the altar, it was most likely the amice. It would seem from Sir Thomas More that the amice was worn over the head at the altar. He says in controversy with Tindall that 'he would have the peple pull the priest from the aulter and y<sup>e</sup> amis from his head.'<sup>1</sup> At Paris the amice was worn over the head during Mass, except from the *Sursum Corda* to the ablutions; at Auxerre, except from the beginning of Mass, *Introibo ad altare Dei* until after the *Placeat Tibi*; at Soissons, except from the *Orate Fratres* to the end. The Dominican Friars to this day wear the amice on the head except when actually at the altar. If the editor had been aware of the close connexion of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Workes of Sir Thomas More, Knight*, London, 1557, p. 641, col. ii. F. Sir Thomas More knew the difference between a cope and a chasuble, yet he says, at p. 365, col. ii. H., 'they care not as Tyndall sayth after, whyther the prieste saye Masse in his gowne or in hys cope.' In the woodcut in Marcellus (*Rituum Ecclesiasticorum* Lib. ii. Venetiis, 1516), the pope is apparently celebrating the Eucharist in a cope. There appear to be mediæval inventories of very poor churches in England where the cope is the only silken vestment.

Dominican with the national rites, we cannot think he would have neglected the opportunity of throwing a flood of light upon his task from a liturgy still living.

It will have been seen that the choice of foreign authorities quoted has not been altogether an enlightened one. Let us turn to the writers quoted in the mother tongue. On the last page we read the *dictum* of 'a liturgical writer of authority.' Quite by accident, we have been enabled to discover this 'writer of authority.' It is the gentleman who does the notes in the *Kalendar of the English Church*, and the *dictum* in question may be found on p. 22 of the *Kalendar* for 1886. As it turns out, Mr. St. John Hope's paper read last November at St. Paul's has shown that in the middle ages the Sunday colour often differed from the week day, and this notion is therefore not 'simply the private invention of some ingenious ritualist.' But the claim to be considered 'a writer of authority' may be appraised by the inspection of a statement on p. 60 of the *Kalendar*. We are told the holy oils are 'Chrism, Confirmation oil, and Baptismal oil. Chrism is at present used in the English Church at Coronations.' Reference to the books that are in everybody's hands might have saved this 'writer of authority' from making a blunder that shows that he has not yet begun the alphabet of ritual. Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, or better still, English mediæval authorities like Lyndwood's *Provinciale* or the Pontificals printed by the Surtees Society, would have told him that the three oils are chrism (*ang.* cream), the oil of catechumens, and the oil of the sick. The oil used at Confirmation was chrism, a mixture of oil and balm; and the kings of England have been anointed since the time of James I. with simple oil, said to be blessed early on the morning of the Coronation by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster. The oil of the sick, for which there is direct authority from Scripture, this writer does not speak of.

There is another *Kalendar* which professes to teach Churchmen something about their Prayer Book, and to which we shall do no great wrong if we ally it with *Notes on Ceremonial*. It is the *Church Kalendar* published by Letts. Under the Black Letter Festivals we read of St. Valentine, called in the Prayer Book *Bishop and Martyr*, that he was 'a holy priest in Rome. Probably never a bishop, though sometimes so described.' Then follows a paragraph taken without acknowledgment from Alban Butler. This is an instance of the way in which Prayer Book statements are set aside if they are

supposed to clash with Roman statements. We find also P. M., that is, Presbyter and Martyr, after St. Valentine's name in the *Order of Divine Service* published by Hayes, Jackson's *Church of England Kalendar* published by Westell,<sup>1</sup> and, we regret to say, the *Churchman's Diary* published by Masters.

Before rejecting a tradition that had come down to the Prayer Book from the Sarum Missal it may be thought that these editors would have taken the trouble to make an investigation that need not have lasted a moment. But apparently it was enough that the Pian Calendar commemorated only a presbyter and martyr for them to be sure that the Church of England was wrong. Had they but looked into a Roman Martyrology they would have found that on February 14th there are commemorated two St. Valentines: one the presbyter and martyr of the Pian Calendar; the other the bishop and martyr of the Sarum Missal and the Sealed Book. The latter was bishop of Interamna; there appear to be in Italy three towns with this name; one near to Rome, where, indeed, the bishop is said to have been beheaded.

We really do not care to weigh our words before such a conspiracy of ignorance and disloyalty. We may take this one point as a measure of the attachment to the Church of England, of the accuracy of the information, and of the depth of the research which these Calendars display. In a matter of mere history, not of dogma or ritual, the words of the Prayer Book are held of no account, if there be the least Roman authority on the other side. Plain enough sign where the hearts of these writers are.

On the other hand, if words mean aught, the preface to *Notes on Ceremonial* leads us to expect a most rigorous observance of the letter of the Book of Common Prayer. We read that 'the Book of Common Prayer has been taken as of course of paramount authority,' and that 'in no case has an

<sup>1</sup> This almanack for 1887 contains food for awful mirth on nearly every page. This *Church of England Kalendar* tells us that 'when the Sovereign Pontiffs spoke, the listening nations of the earth were silent.' We are introduced to Dr. Frederick George Lee as a 'faithful historian.' As a 'proof' that St. Helena was born at Colchester it is said that the town bears a 'knotty cross between four crowns.' One chapter deals with the manner of lighting and putting out candles, with a note of regret that 'the consuetudinary of Sarum is silent upon this important subject.' But our amusement passes into indignation when a man who seems never to have heard of *Barbara celarent*, or asked if Propositions and Judgements be the same, begins to teach us philosophy, and sets amongst atheists and sceptics the honoured name of Bishop Berkeley. May it be long before the Catholic Faith find another such an advocate as Mr. Richard C. Jackson, F.R.H.S., &c. &c.



Anglican direction been set aside in favour of any other.' Now after a declaration like this we do not expect the least appearance of disrespect or of disobedience to the rubric, and that when the Prayer Book tells the celebrant to begin the service at the north side we suppose that he will be directed in *Notes on Ceremonial* to begin at some part of the altar which is at least towards the north. On the contrary, he is told to stand at the south end (§ 443), 'the proper ritual position.' Suppose we allow the argumentation that would show that any part of the long west side of the altar (as it is now placed) is the north side, it follows that one who stands at the north end of this side obeys the rubric just as much as one who stands in the middle or at the south end of this long western side, and he does not cause the scandal of a seeming disregard of the rubrics. For it will be hard to persuade any ordinary person who approaches the subject without any special knowledge that the north side means a part of the altar turned altogether away from the north. He will be unable to appreciate the charms of 'the proper ritual position,' and think it is only another instance of wanton disobedience to the plain rubrics of the Prayer Book, which, in the hands of directory-makers, can be manipulated to mean anything.

Mr. Micklethwaite, in his paper (p. 155), has pointed out that the monks of the Charterhouse began their preparation at the north side of the altar, that is, the left hand of those who look at the altar from the nave of the church. And the Mass of the Charterhouse is acknowledged by all to represent an ancient form which has very likely undergone few changes since St. Bruno, who died in 1101.<sup>1</sup> By some it is

<sup>1</sup> 'Stans autem sacerdos ad sinistrum cornu altaris iuxta lectorium ubi semper a celebratore fit confessio; versa facie ad cathedram iungit manus inclinatus ad confessionem. Qua facta inclinatus iunctis manibus dicit ante faciem altaris orationem dominicam . . .' (*Repertorium Statutorum ordinis cartusiensis*, Basil. 1510. Prima pars statutorum antiquorum, cap. xliii. § 13). It is possible the editor of *Notes on Ceremonial* may think Mr. Micklethwaite wrong in interpreting *sinistrum* as the north side of the altar. On this subject it is important to remember what Mr. Maskell tells us in *The Ancient Liturgy*, &c., 2nd ed. p. 19, n. 19: 'In examining the Old Uses the student will find much confusion, if he takes for a guide the modern Roman books, respecting the right and left corner of the Altar. In the English Liturgies the right means the *Epistle* side, and the left the *Gospel* side. In all the old Roman Orders such was the custom up to the end of the fifteenth century, taking it to be the right hand and the left of the officiating priest, as well as of those who were standing by. But in the year 1485 the Roman Pontifical, published at Venice, laid down as a rule that the right hand and the left were to be taken from the crucifix upon the Altar, by which new arrangement of course the old was entirely reversed.'

held to represent the Lyons Rite at the time of St. Bruno, just as the Dominican Rite is held to represent the Paris Rite of the time of St. Dominic.

Another recommendation of wanton disobedience to the Rubrics may be found in §§ 44-6, 128, 167, 271. The alms are to be brought to the priest to be set on the altar after the bread and wine have been set thereon. Now the Rubrics are plain that the alms are to be set first on the altar, and the elements after. This has so lately been insisted upon at the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, both by Mr. Micklethwaite (p. 157) and by Dr. Wickham Legg (p. 115), that we need not further dwell on the point.

Further, the names 'deacon' and 'subdeacon' would have been avoided by one zealous for the Anglican formularies. 'Epistoler' and 'gospeller' are names found in the Middle Ages and in the Canons for the ministers of the altar, whereas the word 'subdeacon' is quite unknown to any English office-book since the Reformation. Neither need there be any discussion as to the vesture of these ministers. 'Albes with tunicles' rest upon exactly the same foundation in law as the chasuble. If the celebrant be bound to wear a chasuble in Advent or Lent, his ministers are equally bound to wear tunicles; and in an Anglican book there ought to be no discussion whether folded chasubles or broad stoles should be worn, or only albes. The English rule is 'albes with tunicles.' There is besides plenty of mediæval authority for tunicles in penitential times. They may often be encountered in the Lenten suits of inventories.

We do not find a word of condemnation in *Notes on Ceremonial* of the practice of setting children to serve the altar. It has, we believe, a most unfortunate effect upon them. And further, the proper minister for the altar is the deacon. Such is the statement of Lebrun, who adds that it is only by sufferance that a simple clerk is allowed to approach the altar.<sup>1</sup>

It is when we come to the private prayers of the celebrant that the directory-writers show themselves at their very worst. They have a complete misunderstanding of the history and structure both of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Missal (be it Sarum or Roman) from which they borrow. In *Notes on Ceremonial* the celebrant is told to say, while vesting, the *Veni Creator* and the psalm *Judica*, preparatory prayers with which no fault can be found, so long as they are recited in the vestry. But we quite agree with Mr. Micklethwaite (p. 154), that no preparation but that ordered in the Prayer-

<sup>1</sup> Pierre le Brun, *Explication littérale, etc. . . de la Messe*, traité préliminaire, § viii., Paris, 1777, t. i. p. 97.

Book should be said in the presence of the congregation. The attempt to combine the preparation from the Sarum Missal with that in the Prayer-Book has been as unsuccessful as is usual in *Notes on Ceremonial*. In the first place the Lord's Prayer is apparently said three times, once in the vestry, once on the step of the altar, and again at the altar. In the old Sarum Missal it is clear that the Lord's Prayer was said but once, the *Ave Maria* being a late interpolation. So, too, we hardly think that if the priest kiss the ministers before the congregation it will be a ceremony edifying to all. Mr. Maskell, by a slip of the pen, has declared this osculation to be a peculiarity of the Sarum Missal,<sup>1</sup> and on that account a Sarum Ritualist would no doubt go to the stake rather than forego the practice. But it is not particular to Sarum. It was and is done at this point in the service at Rome,<sup>2</sup> and Martene speaks of it at Salzburg and Soissons,<sup>3</sup> and it is to be found in the books of Sienna<sup>4</sup> and many other places.<sup>5</sup>

The *Oremus* before the kiss is also not understood. It is said (p. 112, note *k*) to show that a collect once existed here. In our opinion this *Oremus*, which is found very constantly in the rites just as the priest goes up to the altar, is the solemn invitation of the celebrant to the congregation to join in the *Missa Catechumenorum* which is just about to begin. In the same way we find an *Oremus* after the Gospel; or Creed when that is said. Its presence is commonly explained by saying that it is the introduction to the *Secreta*. The objection to this is that the *Oremus* is separated from the *Secreta* by all the ceremonies of the Offertory. To us it seems to be the resumptive invitation after the expulsion of the catechumens, and that it marks the beginning of the *Missa Fidelium*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> William Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (London, 1846), p. 14, note 16.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent III., *De Myst. Missæ*, II. xi; *Ordo Romanus*, i. § 8; John England, *Explanation . . . of the Mass* (Rome, 1833), pt. ii. p. 144.

<sup>3</sup> Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. art. xii. ordd. xiii., xv. and xxii.

<sup>4</sup> *Ordo Officiorum Eccles. Senensis*, ed. Trombelli (Bonon. 1766), p. 444.

<sup>5</sup> See *Ecclesiologist* (1848), viii. 100 n.; Bona, *De Rebus Liturg.* lib. ii. cap. ii. § 111: 'Oscula tum ministrorum, tum Evangelii et Altaris, in omnibus fere antiquis Ritualibus sancita sunt.'

<sup>6</sup> How completely the idea of discipline has been lost in some quarters the following incident may show. We were present at the celebration of the Eucharist in a well-known London church, and there wandered in a man who was dressed like a native of India, probably, therefore, a Mahomedan or Hindoo by religion. The Consecration was at hand, yet the churchwarden, without any inquiry, positively invited the Pagan to come in and be present at the Christian mysteries. The very officer whose duty it was to guard the door against the profane threw it

Then through all the modern directories, including *Notes on Ceremonial*, runs an idea—quite a false one, we think—that it is wrong for the celebrant to be engaged in any liturgical action without at the same time reciting some form of words. Now there is a proverb that actions speak louder than words, a notion not without importance in the philosophy of ceremonial. Our Prayer-Book, for example, does not order the celebrant to say anything when he sets the alms, or the bread and wine, on the altar. The late Canon Simmons<sup>1</sup> showed that the English directions at the Offertory are closely paralleled by the rubrics of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and of the words of the Septuagint itself (Exodus xxv. 30). The rubrics of the ancient Greek Liturgies equal in shortness the 'meagre directions' of the Book of Common Prayer. It would be an excellent thing for those who are continually adding to the Book of Common Prayer little *formulæ*, nearly always superfluous and not always free from superstition, to take the Gregorian Sacramentary in hand.<sup>2</sup> The directions from the Introit to the Preface are brevity itself. There is no *Confiteor*, no *Munda cor meum*, before the Gospel, and none of the prayers at the Offertory or at Communion which we find at length in *Notes on Ceremonial*. Indeed, we know something about the date at which these prayers were introduced into the Missal. Micrologus<sup>3</sup> speaks of the *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas* and the *Veni Sanctificator* as Gallican corruptions arising in his time, superfluous, and ordained by no Roman *Ordo*; for the Roman *Ordo* had no prayer from the Anthem of the Offertory up to the *Secreta* said just before the Preface.<sup>4</sup> The same condemnation of being unknown to the *Ordo* is passed upon the prayer *Domine Jesu Christe*, which is now said just before the Communion. It would seem that in Micrologus's time the private prayers which have open to them. The number of unbaptized and of Pagans in England surely makes some precautions highly desirable.

<sup>1</sup> T. F. Simmons, *Alms and Oblations* (London, 1882), p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> See it in Muratori's *Liturgia Romana Vetus* (Venetiis, 1748), tome ii. col. i., or at the end of Mr. Hammond's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*.

<sup>3</sup> Micrologus, *De Ecclesiasticis Observationibus*, capp. 11 and 18, apud Hittorp.

<sup>4</sup> The *Secreta* is a Collect which varies with the day, said after the Offertory and before the *Sursum corda*. Sometimes the term is used of the Canon, because that is said secretly, and it is only when it is ended that the priest says the Lord's Prayer in an audible voice. It may be useful to remind some of the directory-makers that liturgical scholars are agreed that the Canon ends with the Lord's Prayer, though the printers carry the running title of *Canon Missæ* up to the Gospel of St. John. The Tours Missal of 1533 continues this title on to the *Benedicite* and other prayers which the priest says after Mass, and we have seen the same thing in other books.

now become part of the Roman Missal were just beginning to make their appearance, and he complains of additions and alterations even in the Canon itself.

These last words bring us to a part of the service where a practice is followed—very widely followed, we fear—but of which we cannot speak too severely. We mean the custom of encasing the Anglican Consecration Prayer in a number of *formulae* translated from the Gregorian Canon, as if our own *formulae* were not good and valid. In the first place these additional *formulae* are entirely superfluous, for the intercessory prayers which are recited before and after consecration in the Roman Canon have their equivalent in the Prayer for the Church Militant. Further, the employment of these forms is disloyal, for it tends to throw doubt upon the completeness and orthodoxy of the English Service, and to foster the Ultramontane idea that a valid Liturgy is only to be attained by the use of the same forms that the Church of Rome uses to-day. A singular want of real liturgical knowledge is shown by the fact that in none of the directories do we notice any attempt to supply the most glaring defect of the Roman Canon, the absence of an epiclesis before or after the words of institution. No doubt it is this fault in the Gregorian Canon which has caused a distinct epiclesis to be absent from our English book. In some quarters, however, this imperfection is looked upon as a merit; and we know an instance in Scotland of the national rite there being rejected and the English chosen, because the latter was more like the Roman in having no epiclesis. Thus extremes meet.

And they meet also elsewhere. We have all heard of that revision of the Prayer-Book which, after the doings of 1689, was made ready to be submitted to Convocation. We have before us an edition of this strange book, brought out by Mr. John Taylor in 1855. At the end of his Introduction the editor recommends that this awful example of trying to improve the Prayer-Book be taken to church and there used with the 'ancient service.' It is seen that this trick of farcing (as our mediæval forefathers would have called it) the English Service with other Liturgies is a game that two can play at; and all kinds of Zwinglian, Unitarian, and blasphemous forms may be privately said by clergymen concurrently with those in the Prayer-Book, and the excuse made that others are permitted and encouraged to use the same licence.

The use of one prayer taken from the Missal after the canon is finished—for example, the *Agnus Dei*—is not so entirely objectionable, because the use of this *formulae* was allowed

under Edward VI.'s First Book,<sup>1</sup> and it is found in other parts of the Prayer-Book. But it is a late addition to the Gregorian Sacramentary; and further, it is addressed to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, whereas all Eucharistic prayers should undoubtedly be offered to the Eternal Father, as the majority of the collects are. We agree with Mr. Micklethwaite in considering that the mixing of the two sacred elements in the chalice just before communion is with us undesirable (p. 160), though there may be another opinion as to the origin of the custom besides that which he expresses.

After the Post Communion Collect nothing follows in the Gregorian Sacramentary, save perhaps the declaration of the deacon to the people, *Ite, missa est*. We see a survival of this in the order to shut the book as soon as the Post Communion is said continued in the rubrics of the Roman Missal of today. After *Ite, missa est* all is modern accretion, and perhaps this is the reason that nearly all these *formulae* of late addition have been taken over by the directory-makers and set in their books as desirable devotions for Anglicans. If English clergymen find the use of these prayers at the end of the service edifying, we have no desire to abridge their lawful liberty; but they have no right to use them before the congregation, and still less to make the congregation stay in church till the private prayers of the priest be over. At Rouen in the last century the people left the church as soon as the celebrant began to read the 'last Gospel.'<sup>2</sup>

In one or two points these *Notes on Ceremonial* have heedlessly stumbled into common sense. In a diagram of the altar at the beginning of the third edition we notice the mediæval two lights only, instead of the six Renaissance candles of the first edition; and we are also told that there is no virtue in reserving candles to be lit only at the celebration of the Eucharist. There is a condemnation, half-hearted though it be, of the modern palla, that is, a piece of pasteboard enclosed in a corporal and used to cover the sacred elements. We do not see why the custom of the Church of Lyons and, up to the last few years, of the Church of England too, to cover the chalice with a second corporal should not be retained.<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> It may be noticed that the monks of the Charterhouse did not say the *Agnus Dei* until after the Communion, 'Cum sacerdos aqua digitos abluit incipitur Agnus Dei' (*loc. cit.* § 53). This has its analogue in the Edwardian First Book, where it was sung in Communion time.

<sup>2</sup> De Moleon, *Voyages Liturgiques de France*: Paris, 1718, p. 229.

<sup>3</sup> We have seen this actually in use at Lyons; and it is probably a custom of some antiquity, for it may be found in the Lyons Missal of 1866 as well as in the edition of De Montazet.



modern palla is unclean and irreverent, and contrary to the settled custom which ordains that nothing but pure linen, without admixture of silk or other material, should be used to cover the consecrated elements. Some progress in study has also been made between 1876 and 1888. The editor of 1888 is no longer under the belief that Pierre Lebrun, the Oratorian, is the same as Lebrun-Desmarettes, the acolyte. It contrasts favourably in some ways with other directories. It wants the pert manner of *Ceremonial of the Altar*, which we noticed in July last, and the inflated style of other books.

We do not think that *Notes on Ceremonial* is a book that will repay a long study or analysis. We have found the examination of it necessary for this article dull and wearisome beyond words; and we have only spoken of it at this length because it has been reprinted more than once, and even this measure of popularity is owing to the incredible imprudence with which it has been recommended nearly every week to the correspondents of a well-known contemporary. The work shows no traces of special learning, special aptitude for liturgical studies, or scholarship. The editor cannot verify quotations from such a liturgical writer as Micrologus, whom he quotes from Lebrun as *Le Micrologue* (p. 111, note e). It is ill-printed and full of misprints. We have *alieniate* instead of *alienate* (p. xiv), *crux lingea* instead of *crux lignea* (p. 189, note a), *ornaments noirs* instead of *ornements noirs* (p. 195, note c), and the like. We may well ask if, instead of taking as a motto a quotation from the Vulgate, with a reference to the English version of the Psalms, we ought not to have had the fraudulent counsel given by the Franciscan friar: 'Large be your promise, your performance small.'

If *Notes on Ceremonial* represent the kind of service in churches where there is an 'advanced ritual,' we do not wonder at Mr. Mickelthwaite telling us that 'the ritual of our churches, and especially of those where a high ritual is practised, is generally very bad' (p. 150). If, however, we turn to Mr. Mickelthwaite's *Suggestions*, we find ourselves in a much happier clime. Not in words only but in fact they defer to the Prayer-Book as of paramount authority; and without committing ourselves to all Mr. Mickelthwaite's opinions and statements, we think his paper valuable. It is a relief to breathe a more manly, as well as a more scholarly, air. But it seems to us that more than one of his recommendations can hardly be accepted without a breach of the law and tradition of the English Church. We do not, for example, feel quite convinced that the suggestions as to the treatment of the *Gloria*

*in excelsis* (p. 161) in its new place in the Anglican Liturgy will commend themselves to those in authority; and, seeing that the mantle of Pugin has fallen upon Mr. Micklethwaite as a denouncer of altar-cards, it is truly surprising to find the recommendation of 'a tablet or card' for the commandments at p. 155. But these are details. In their broad outlines Mr. Micklethwaite's *Suggestions* contrast favourably with the petty fussiness of the functioneer (a word we will borrow from him). Let it not, however, be thought that Mr. Micklethwaite's ceremonial is bare. We would characterize it as a profuse, but not elaborate, ritual; no minute trifling with ceremonies, but a giving of the best that a parish had, in its own way, unfettered by many rules. We would specially endorse Mr. Micklethwaite's insistence upon the exercise in ceremonial 'of the faculties of reason and taste which the pedants are pleased to condemn as eclecticism' (p. 153), and his prophecy that if we will only set up a reasonable service, not an unreasonable farcing from other rites, 'we may make the service in our English Prayer-Book the grandest office which is said now in any church in Christendom' (p. 161). We agree that it is of very great importance that a school of English ceremonial should be formed at this moment; a school which shall be in sympathy with Andrewes and Cosin, as well as with Clement Maydeston and St. Osmund, and which shall take the letter and text of the Prayer-Book as the Court beyond which there is no appeal.

That English ceremonial is a matter of principles, and not of detail, we would again repeat. How unfettered by minute rules English parishes were in the Middle Ages Mr. St. John Hope, in his paper on 'Mediaeval Liturgical Colours' at St. Paul's, has lately taught us. Some broad rules they very likely had, such as a light or two burning on the altar at Mass, a chasuble or cope for the celebrant,<sup>1</sup> but nothing like the Renaissance bondage to which some of our advisers of to-day would commit us. Mr. Hope finds that in the use of colours not only each diocese, but each parish, seems to have done exactly as it pleased; and if this were so with one set of ceremonies of no great moment, it seems likely that it was the same with others. In fact, uniformity in petty ceremonies never seems to have been wished for in the Church of England until our own day.

Of late years the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society has done good service to the Church of England, and is becoming no

<sup>1</sup> The confusion between chasuble and cope which we sometimes meet with may be due partly to the want of order caused by the absence of proper vestries in mediæval churches, and still more by the want of funds to supply both.

unworthy successor of the Society founded so many years ago at Cambridge. It has appreciated the wideness of the scope implied by the term Ecclesiological, and remembered that Mr. Beresford-Hope, in his opening address on the foundation of the Society, defined the science of ecclesiology as the science of worship. Very valuable papers have appeared in the *Transactions*, not only on architecture, but on ritual, the various ecclesiastical *instrumenta*, and furniture, and other liturgical subjects. The Society deserves support at the hands of students of Christian antiquities, particularly as it is almost the only representative of these studies in London.

There has lately appeared a life of the President of Magdalen, whose celebrated advice to *verify references* might have been remembered by a former Demy before he began a recent controversy with the head of the Pusey House. In it we read of one who had more than mastered the rudiments of Divinity, and who asked the President what books he could now profitably work at. The answer was, first the Gospel of St. Matthew, then of St. Mark, then of St. Luke, and then of St. John. We feel almost sure that if Dr. Routh had lived in our day, and been asked a like question in Liturgy by an Englishman, he would have told the inquirer to take the Common Prayer as the basis of his studies. That it would be a better guide for him in his duties as a priest than any number of directories there can be no doubt.

There appears to us to be a remarkable dearth of qualifications in those who are engaged in making these unauthorized attempts to elevate, forsooth! the tone of the Book of Common Prayer. There is, we need scarcely say, a singular lack of modesty in men who deliberately take it upon themselves to issue instructions which the Church alone has any right to issue—and who issue them anonymously. But there is also a distinct lack of gift and genius. The refinement and spirituality of the artist are absent. Their touch is heavy-handed; there is a vulgar lifelessness in their treatment of detail, an insistence upon the letter of the subject, and an exaggeration which is most wearisome, and which is fatal to the spirit of that on which they are engaged. They lack both eye and hand, as well as religious taste and reverence, in a singular degree. Childishness and fussiness are stamped upon their handiwork, to the sore loss of spiritual life and manly dignity. They are really not of the class of mind which should venture to lay hands on such a subject. They have taken upon themselves to speak, but they speak without commission, and appear to us to darken counsel by words without knowledge.

## ART. X.—JOHN GERSON.

1. *Joannis Gersonii Opera Omnia in V tomos distributa.* (Antwerpiae, 1706.)
2. *Histoire du Concile de Pise.* Par JACQUES LENFANT. (Utrecht, 1731.)
3. *Histoire du Concile de Constance.* Par JACQUES LENFANT. (Amsterdam, 1714.)
4. *Essai sur J. Gerson.* Par C. SCHMIDT. (Paris, 1839.)

JEAN CHARLIER, born at Gerson, in the diocese of Rheims, and taking from that place the name by which he is usually known, was one of those extraordinary men who united the zeal, energy, and learning of the highest order of political Churchman with the depth of religious feeling of the most devout ascetic. With eloquence and acquirements sufficient to place him at the head of the foremost university of Europe, to make him a power in the State, and almost the director of two general councils, he was equally remarkable for qualities of a different order. He was endowed with a depth of devotion bordering on mysticism, and had composed writings sufficiently replete with pious thoughts to make it a doubtful point, even to this day, whether he were not the author of the first devotional work of Christendom, the *De Imitatione Christi*.<sup>1</sup> Gerson stands conspicuous in that band of remarkable men, who, through all the disorder and corruption induced by the unhappy ambition of the popes, preserved intact and advocated with unflinching power the best traditions of the authority and rights of the Church. While he scourged those who invaded these, either from above or from below, he was equally zealous to demonstrate that the great purpose of the Church was holiness, and to denounce every sort of moral abuse. His life was spent in a period the most trying ecclesiastically of any in the history of the Church. Born towards the close of the 'Babylonish Captivity' (1363), his early manhood witnessed the terrible scandals, the ceaseless quarrels, the utter demoralization of the Great Schism. As a youth he would be able to indulge melancholy speculations as to whether the Roman Pope Urban, or the French Pope Clement VII. was the author of the greater abuses and more open scandals; and he would soon see them both eclipsed by that most accom-

<sup>1</sup> See the elaborate disquisitions on this point by M. Gence. (Paris, 1837.)

plished of simoniacs, Boniface IX., who not only sold all his benefices, but sold them many times over. Amidst such fearful abuses as those depicted by Nicholas de Clemanges, in his treatise on the *Corrupt State of the Church*, Gerson passed his early academic life; when (if we may trust this secretary of a pope) it was commonly said that the only time a pope had the Scriptures in his hand was when he laid his hand upon the cover of the volume to swear that he knew and understood its contents; when simony was so universal that the standing joke among bishops was that the text, 'Freely ye have received, freely give,' did not apply to them, as they had received by no means freely, but for heavy payments; when licentiousness and debauchery were almost universally prevalent among the clergy; and the state of the convents was such that it was commonly said that to send a daughter to take the veil was to give her over to prostitution.<sup>1</sup>

Gerson's reputation as a scholar and divine advanced very rapidly. In the year 1395, that is to say when he was only thirty-two years of age, he reached the highest point of dignity in the University of Paris, that of chancellor and professor of theology. To that same year may be assigned the first of his treatises on the state of the Church, not composed in the spirit of bitter satire like the treatise of Clemanges, but in a calm and earnest temper, intent upon advocating reform. The moderation of tone is the more remarkable, as in the previous year (1394) there had occurred an aggravation of the schism, and another step in perpetuating it. In that year the University of Paris had presented a 'judgment' to Pope Clement VII. calling upon both popes for abdication, or in case of their refusal advising a general council to be held to enforce it. This judgment, being supported by the French cardinals, so overwhelmed Pope Clement that he died in a few days after its reception. For a moment the Roman Pope (Boniface) reigned alone, but the Avignonist party would not submit to be thus humbled. They hastily chose a successor to Clement—a man whom they knew they could trust to fight the battle to the bitter end—Peter di Luna, a Spaniard, who succeeded as Benedict XIII. It was under these circumstances that Gerson, now occupying the foremost place in the University of Paris, counselled moderation. He would not have charges of schism or heresy made against Benedict, but would recommend the meeting of a council 'of his obedience' to consider the state of things.

<sup>1</sup> N. de Clemanges, *De Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu* (in Von der Hardt, Concil. Constant. t. i. pt. iii.), chaps. xviii.-xx. Lenfant, Conc. Const. pp. 634 sq.

'It  
is wrong  
One m  
lidity o  
seek th  
or by  
anathe  
make  
certain

G  
Coun  
creasi  
resign  
therel  
would  
appal  
to wit  
which  
to his  
did n  
opini  
In Ju  
300 b  
53, to  
howe  
and c  
sign.  
coun  
coun  
being  
could  
they  
perju  
were  
quest  
are s  
at is

F  
what  
and v  
every  
this  
unto  
perha

'It is no heresy,' he argues, 'to say that A or B is not pope. It is wrong to say that all who differ are heretics and excommunicate. One may obey with a tacit reservation. It is wrong to deny the validity of the Sacraments to those opposed. It is more wholesome to seek the unity of the Church by endeavouring to procure the cession, or by subtraction of obedience, than to try to bring it about by anathemas. To depose the Pope and to create a new one would make a third schism much worse than the former, inasmuch as it is certain that many would remain with the Pope deposed.'<sup>1</sup>

Gerson here foresees exactly what came to pass after the Council of Pisa. But moderate courses soon became increasingly difficult. Benedict had taken a solemn oath to resign if it should appear that the schism could be healed thereby; once firmly established as pope he declared that he would rather be flayed alive than resign. At this many were appalled, regarding it as manifest perjury, and were prepared to withdraw their obedience. Gerson then wrote a treatise, which appears indeed full of hair-splittings, but which was due to his earnest desire for peace, to show that the Pope's action did not amount to perjury.<sup>2</sup> This, however, was not the opinion at which the majority of his fellow-Churchmen arrived. In July 1398 a council held at Paris, which was attended by 300 bishops and doctors, agreed, by a majority of 247 against 53, to withdraw obedience from Pope Benedict. No sooner, however, had this been agreed upon than a new crop of doubts and difficulties seemed to arise. Benedict still refused to resign. How was he to be compelled to resign? Could a council compel him? If so it must at any rate be a lawful council, and the general opinion among divines then was (they being misled by the false Decretals) that no lawful council could be summoned without the Pope's origination. Could they transfer allegiance to the antipope? He was as much perjured as his rival, and, moreover, strong political reasons were against it. To discuss the pros and cons of this difficult question Gerson wrote another treatise,<sup>3</sup> in which all the points are stated with much ingenuity. But the conclusion he arrives at is a melancholy one.

From these matters, which I have thus handled, one may see in what a labyrinth, with scarce a possibility of escape, we are placed, and with what fetters we are bound. Since these difficulties are on every side, and we know not what to do, I in my folly can see only this remaining, that with King Jehosaphat we should raise our eyes unto God, if perchance He will turn away His anger from us; if perhaps He will no longer take away wisdom from our wise men and

<sup>1</sup> J. Gersonii 'De Modo se Habendi tempore Schismatis,' *Opera*, ii. 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 14.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 18.



elders, as He seems hitherto to have taken it away. Although that this should be done for us amidst such a medley of abominable sins, and so great a multiplication of infamous crimes, which are left unpunished, I can scarcely expect and hope. My only hope is that the mercy of God is infinite.<sup>1</sup>

It is doubtful, indeed, whether Gerson's own contribution towards solving these difficulties tended much to that end, for in all his treatises written at this time every possible alternative is stated, and every possible difficulty and objection to every course is urged. In 1403 the Church of France, which had remained five years without any papal allegiance, and in a state of active hostility against Benedict, who was besieged in Avignon for four years by the French army, returned to its allegiance, on condition that he should resign in case of Boniface's resignation or death, and that he should speedily call a general council. Upon this occasion Gerson preached a sermon, in which he rejoices greatly over the return of France to the obedience, declares that the Pope had learned many lessons of spiritual mindedness through the hardships which had been inflicted upon him, and expresses ardent hopes for peace and quietness and mutual forbearance.<sup>2</sup> As yet the good doctor had by no means reached the mind and the views which he afterwards advocated with such vigour at Constance. On its return to obedience Gerson was designated by the French Church to represent it in the Pope's Court, and several sermons preached before Benedict at that time remain among his works. On the Feast of the Circumcision (1404) he spoke out boldly on the grievous state of the Church:—

'What evil, what danger, what confusion has been brought by the contempt of Holy Scripture, which is surely sufficient for the government of the Church (otherwise Christ would have been an imperfect legislator), let experience answer. Look at the clergy, who ought to be wedded to the wisdom that is from above; have they not committed fornication with that adulterous and prostitute wisdom which is of the earth, sensual and devilish? Has not the state of the Church become as it were brutal and monstrous to such a degree, that some do not hesitate to question whether it be not better to be governed by human inventions than by the divine law of the Gospel, as though the soul were of less value than the body?'<sup>3</sup>

The action of the King and Church of France at this period is interesting, as it bears a close analogy to the proceedings of King Henry VIII. and the Church of England at the Reformation. For five years the Church in France had gone on without a papal head. No payments had been made to any

<sup>1</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 35.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 61.

papal  
been co  
prelates  
firmed  
obedien  
as irre  
due to  
France  
much  
Pope I  
at the  
resign  
Lenfar  
but an  
from F  
wrote h  
and Di  
makes  
to the  
Grego  
under  
the sch  
earnest  
took a  
these  
ness,  
Christ  
the de  
meeting  
(De  
Convo  
how t  
porter  
throw  
‘T  
the de  
asserti  
cessive  
to the  
and th  
nor re  
1 L  
3 I  
the pa  
at the  
4 C

papal officers. All bishoprics and other elective dignities had been conferred by those to whom it belonged to elect; the prelates had appointed to minor benefices, and the King confirmed all by his ordinance. When, at the restitution of obedience, the Pope endeavoured to treat these preferments as irregular, and to recover the arrears which he held to be due to him, he was peremptorily stopped by a royal decree. France had been brought back to her allegiance to Benedict, much to the satisfaction of Gerson, who had greatly lauded Pope Benedict. What then must have been his feelings when, at the death of his rival Boniface, Benedict utterly refused to resign or to call a council! 'It was perceived in France,' says Lenfant, 'that all the protestations of Benedict were nothing but an absolute farce,'<sup>1</sup> and obedience was again withdrawn from Benedict (1406). It was upon this occasion that Gerson wrote his treatise called *Trilogus*, in which *Zelus*, *Benevolentia*, and *Discretio* are introduced as interlocutors, and in which he makes most impassioned appeals to Benedict to restore peace to the Church by resigning.<sup>2</sup> The rival of Benedict was now Gregory XII., an aged man, elected by the Roman cardinals under the most solemn promises to resign, in order to bring the schism to an end, if his rival would also resign. The most earnest endeavours were made by the French, in which Gerson took a leading part, to bring about this result, but neither of these aged prelates would trust the other, and by their shiftiness, falsity, and palpable ambition they fairly exasperated Christendom against them both.<sup>3</sup> In the interval between the decree of the French King repudiating Benedict, and the meeting of the Council of Pisa, Gerson wrote three treatises (*De Terminatione Schismatis*, *De Unitate Ecclesiasticâ*, *De Convocatione Concilii Pisani*). It is interesting to observe how this great Churchman, who had been so ardent a supporter of Benedict and the papal claims, was gradually led on to throw the Pope over altogether in favour of a general council.

'The unity of the Church,' he says, 'ought to be based rather on the deliberations and votes of the Council, than on the allegations or assertions of those who are contending about the Papacy. For excessive and carnal self-love is wont to lead into impious errors, even to the imitation of Lucifer, so that men seek to be adored as gods, and think themselves subject to no man, having neither fear of God nor regard of men.'<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lenfant, *Concile de Pise*, p. 157.

<sup>2</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 83.

<sup>3</sup> It was at this period that a law was passed in France to withdraw the payment of annates from the Pope, precisely similar to the act passed at the beginning of the English Reformation.

<sup>4</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 121.

'The unity of the Church is based upon Christ its spouse, in whom we are all one, as the Apostle says. And if He has no Vicar, through his death, either natural or civil; or if it be not to be expected with probability that obedience either to him or his successors will be paid by Christians; then the Church, by Divine and natural right, can assemble in a general council to procure and provide a Vicar, and this not necessarily by the authority of the Lord Cardinals, but by the aid of any prince or any other Christian; for the mystical body of the Church, founded by Christ, has no less right and strength to procure its own union than any other civil body.'<sup>1</sup>

These principles—the right of the Church to shake itself free of the Popes when the important matter of unity was involved—were generally accepted throughout Christendom in the year 1408. The cardinals of both the contending Popes agreed to meet in council, and the English Church, which had supported Gregory; as well as the French Church, which had supported Benedict, met on common ground. The deputies despatched by the Church of England to bear part in the forthcoming council took Paris on their way, and when there were addressed by Gerson, as Chancellor of the University, in a long oration. Among the English deputies were Henry Chichele, Bishop of St. David's, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who in after times showed a spirited opposition to papal encroachments, and Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, the most outspoken denouncer of ecclesiastical abuses at the Council of Constance. These prelates must have listened with much satisfaction while Gerson strenuously advocated the doctrine that a general council was above the Pope; that it might be called without him, might try, examine, and if necessary depose him; that the Pope, though a sovereign, was a constitutional sovereign, and by no means absolute, or above the Church. Gerson did not himself attend the august assembly of Pisa, where the principles which he had advocated were completely in the ascendant, and the two perjured Popes were formally deposed, and Alexander V. elected. But when this was effected he was invited earnestly to repair to Pisa to address the new Pope and the assembled prelates. The estimation in which his learning and eloquence were held was so high, and so general was the feeling that to him more than to any one else was due the improved aspect of affairs in Christendom, that a summons came to him which he could not refuse. On Ascension Day (1409) he preached before Pope Alexander and the Council on the text, 'Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?' (Acts i. 6).

<sup>1</sup> Gersonii Opera, ii. 114.

Speaking  
in most  
dom by  
she was

'Great  
sheep by  
accusatio  
heaping  
tears can  
are forbid  
purity—l  
words ad  
inebriate  
mischief

The  
with bu  
anything  
place th  
were no  
the ill-a  
bitterne  
strife w  
Mendic  
For Al  
of the v  
the unc  
absoluti  
lyse at  
was sup  
position  
roused  
enemies  
no case  
given th  
for the  
strain :

'By  
of paris  
even of  
the Pop  
from his  
office of  
They ar  
not so h

Speaking in the person of the Church, he addressed the Pope, in most eloquent and moving words, to restore her true kingdom by abating the grievous and terrible scandals with which she was overwhelmed.

'Great is my sorrow,' she is made to say, 'to see some rob my sheep by rapacious avarice, heaping exactions on exactions, inventing accusations, fostering suits, attacking the innocent with false charges, heaping up money, intent only upon worldly business—nor without tears can I behold others polluting themselves with concubinage, who are forbidden marriage in order that they may imitate the angelical purity—licentiousness no longer secret, but openly displayed, foul words added to foul deeds; the belly filled at feasts, taught to be inebriated with wine, and to snore over the cup, and a thousand other mischiefs.'<sup>1</sup>

These ills the Pope is earnestly prayed to attack. Alas! with but little result. Indeed, the new appointment brought anything but comfort to the Chancellor of Paris. In the first place the schism was not healed, but only aggravated, as there were now three popes instead of two; and in the next place the ill-advised proceedings of Alexander V. brought a special bitterness to the University of Paris. The long and fierce strife which that learned body had waged against the obtrusive Mendicants was now renewed with an increase of virulence. For Alexander, a Minorite friar, and a man of no knowledge of the world, had rashly issued a Bull giving to the Minorites the uncontrolled power of hearing confessions and granting absolution in every part of Christendom. This was to paralyse at once the whole work of the Church. The parish priest was superseded in his own parish, his authority was gone, his position rendered untenable. The University of Paris was roused to the keenest indignation by the triumph of its ancient enemies. Royal edicts were put out ordering the clergy in no case to yield to the friars the rights which the Pope had given them, and the Chancellor, lately the vigorous advocate for the authority of the new Pope, now spoke in a different strain:—

'By the essential and fixed ordinance of holy Church the office of parish priests is as good as that of cardinals and archbishops, yea even of the Pope himself, though it be not so high. It follows that the Pope cannot destroy this office (*status*), seeing that it comes not from his positive ordinance, but directly from God Himself. The office of parish priests is higher than that of the simple religious. They are the spouses of the Church as prelates are, though they be not so high, nor ought they to desert their cure or yield it to any one

<sup>1</sup> Gersonii Opera, ii. 139.

without good cause. They have the right of preaching, and neither the Pope nor anyone else is justified in taking this away from them. None can preach in their churches without their leave, nor hear confessions, nor administer the Sacraments.' <sup>1</sup>

'We say, with all reverence to the Holy See and him who sits in it, that the tenor of that Bull appears to us intolerable, and subversive of the whole ecclesiastical state. Who could tolerate, who could ever cease from astonishment, to see the same men begging bread from the people, and at the same time stealing from their superiors the true dignity of their office? Unless these are resisted, what remains, good God, but that, having lost their flocks, the prelates and parish priests, bare, helpless, and trodden under foot by the friars, mendicants in name, but in reality enjoying honours, opulence, and rank, and ordering all things according to their will, should pass their lives in misery? Italy may serve for an example of this. May God avert still worse things, and may no Christian community fall from the eternal Gospel as it did of old into the invention of new sects.' <sup>2</sup>

As Gerson was held the greatest casuist and most learned director of his day, his works contain a large number of treatises on knotty points in morals, the best methods for the confessional, answers to obscure questions of ecclesiastical offences, as well as longer directions for the performance of clerical duties and addresses to the clergy. In these he takes very high ground, and consequently animadverts with terrible severity on the lax and corrupt state of the clergy of his day. In a sermon on the treachery of Judas, which he declares is often repeated now, he says:—

'That ecclesiastic is a betrayer of his Lord who enters the sacred order of priesthood, and then by living licentiously shows himself to be an execrable slave of the devil, when he ought by holy works to prove himself a priest and minister of God. I was about to proceed to show that the priests of our time had reached an iniquity above that of Judas—for Judas betrayed a mortal to death, they betray an immortal—yes, sell, prostitute, defile, tear in pieces, crucify—I was about to do this, but I turned aside to another theme. Something seemed to say to me, "Leave these declamatory complaints. Don't strive in vain, merely procuring hatred for yourself; leave off trying to mend by your words deaf souls, and those harder than the rock. You will harden them rather than soften them. Look at the example of Judas."'<sup>3</sup>

It must be confessed that it would be hard to find a more scorching invective than this. The times, however, and the condition of things in the Church would excuse almost any words of invective, and, in fact, it would seem that there was no language strong enough to denounce the abuses which prevailed. Alexander V. had died after a ten months' reign,

<sup>1</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 436-8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 443-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 592.

not wit  
had, by  
himself  
foul an  
and en  
feelings  
an elec  
which i  
siderab  
In the  
Reform

'Th  
member  
men, w  
Head.  
but only  
the key  
every m  
the who  
and loos  
faithful  
versal C  
and pri  
Pope, c  
is wont  
be dece  
and eve  
than the  
Univers  
alone, b  
should s  
more m  
pope ha  
pope?  
rustic.  
without  
angel a  
God, wh  
charity.  
them, as  
in all th  
crimes:  
such sor  
pope is  
princes  
world."  
it woul  
power, l  
VOL.

not without suspicion of poison, and Cardinal Balthasar Cossa had, by the use of the most flagrant intimidation, forced himself upon the Church as Pope—a man steeped in such foul and almost superhuman vice as to be an absolute portent and enigma in Church history. What must have been the feelings of the holy and most deeply devout Gerson at such an election to the place of the Vicar of Christ? One effect which it manifestly had upon him was to clear his views considerably as to the relations between the Pope and the Church. In the treatise addressed to Cardinal Peter de Alliaco on Reform, he speaks with no uncertain sound :—

‘The Church, catholic and universal, is composed of various members constituting one body, as of Greeks, Latins, Barbarians, men, women, &c. Of this universal Church Christ alone is the Head. The Pope cannot, and ought not, to be called the Head, but only the Vicar of Christ, representing Him on earth, *so long as the key does not go wrong*. And in this Church and in the faith of it every man may be saved, even if there were no pope to be found in the whole world, for to this Church is given the power of binding and loosing; and supposing there were no pope, yet some one of the faithful could apply the remedy of binding and loosing. This universal Church cannot err. But there is another Church, particular and private, included in the Catholic Church, and formed of the Pope, cardinals, bishops, prelates, and ecclesiastical persons. This is wont to be called the Roman Church. This Church may err, be deceived, and deceive others, fall into schism and heresy, and even altogether cease to exist. It is of far less authority than the Universal Church. It is for the unity and safety of the Universal Church that we ought to labour. For this, not princes alone, but even rustics and labourers, even the least who have faith should strive. If a king may be deposed to save a kingdom, much more may a pope be deposed to save the Church. The office of the pope has been magnified by fraud and forgery. For what is the pope? He is a man of ordinary clay, perhaps the son of some poor rustic. He is made pope. Does this make him, without penitence, without confession, without contrition, straightway an impeccable angel and a saint? Who has made him a saint? Not the Spirit of God, who is drawn down, not by dignity, but by God’s grace and charity. As a man he can sin and err, for there have been many of them, as we read in the chronicles, by no means spiritual, but steeped in all the vices of ordinary citizens, falling into heresy and committing crimes such as are committed by those who are not priests. Of such sort we may see for ourselves are the popes of to-day. The pope is not above the Gospel of God, nor is he independent of the princes of the world, for Christ said “My kingdom is not of this world.” He may be deposed for the good of the Church, for indeed it would be ridiculous for a mortal man to say that he had the power, both in heaven and earth, of binding and loosing from sins,



while he himself is the son of perdition, simoniacal, covetous, a liar, a tyrant, a fornicator, proud, puffed up, and worse than the devil; and if Peter had been such an one Christ would never have conferred the keys upon him.<sup>1</sup>

'I am asked whether a council in which the pope does not preside is above the pope. Certainly it is. It is higher in authority, higher in dignity, higher in office. Such a council the pope is bound to obey in all things. Such a council can limit the power of the pope, for to such a council, since it represents the Universal Church, the keys of binding and loosing are given. Such a council can take away papal privileges. Such a council can choose a pope, deprive and depose a pope, make new laws, repeal ancient laws. The pope has not, and never had, the power of granting dispensations from sacred canons made in a general council; nor can he change the acts of the council, nor even give an interpretation to them.'<sup>2</sup>

These principles Gerson continued to advocate in various writings and discourses up to the time of the meeting of the Council of Constance. His view was that peace could only be procured to the Church by the cession of all three of the rival popes, and that if this cession were refused by them or by any of them, then the Church, acting in its corporate capacity, should enforce it by deposing them. As an advocate of these views he came to Constance, not only as one of the deputies of the University, but also as the ambassador of the King of France. His arrival was hailed with acclamation. An historian of the Council says: 'Among the doctors of that age there is none who, in the judgment of the whole world, excels him in virtue, learning, and intrepid and indefatigable zeal for the reformation of morals and for the unity of the Church.'<sup>3</sup> The Council, flattered for a moment by the hope that John XXIII. would voluntarily resign, as he had solemnly promised to do, was awakened from its delusion by his flight, and saw that there was nothing for it but the bold assertion of its authority and the deposition of all three popes. To confirm those who still doubted of the power of the Council to do this, Gerson was invited to preach before it, and delivered his famous sermon on the text, 'Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you.'<sup>4</sup> In this sermon he shows the superiority of the Church of which Christ is the head; that the pope as secondary and subordinate to the Great Head is under the direction and control of the main body represented by a general council met under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; that he can be removed by the council, or his power may be limited, and that he has no

<sup>1</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 163-68.

<sup>2</sup> Lenfant, *Concile de Constance*, i. 75.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 172.

<sup>4</sup> John xii. 35.

authori  
a coun  
the co  
him.  
fram  
still m

'Th  
vation w  
pope.  
the Chu  
spouse  
shall no  
popes h  
adorned  
the Chu  
and use  
may sna  
given th

Gen  
bilitate  
the Cou  
the thre  
with m  
formati  
was m  
honestl  
that th  
slights  
being a  
the cor  
nents, a  
fate. T  
ran :-

'Our  
heretical  
rooted o  
though t  
which of  
out know  
as devil

The  
councils  
so with

authority to set aside the resolutions of such a council ; that a council can in certain cases be lawfully summoned without the concurrence of the pope, and may act independently of him.<sup>1</sup> Certain resolutions of the University of Paris, in the framing of which Gerson no doubt had a hand, put the matter still more tersely :—

‘The Church is more necessary than the pope, as there is no salvation without the Church, but one may very well be saved without the pope. It is more useful, because the pope is for the Church, not the Church for the pope. It is of greater dignity, because it is the spouse of Jesus Christ ; more powerful, because the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, whereas they have often prevailed against popes by their vices and heresies ; it is more wise, because it is adorned with divers gifts, which are often lacking in popes. It is the Church which gives the keys to the pope, and she may resume and use those keys to judge, correct, and depose popes, just as one may snatch a sword out of the hand of a madman, and as she has given the keys for edification and not for destruction.’<sup>2</sup>

Gerson followed up his sermon by a treatise, *De Auferibilitate Papæ ab Ecclesiâ*, and continued to be the ‘soul of the Council’ as it proceeded, as is well known, to deprive all the three rival popes. Gerson joined readily with those who, with more or less sincerity, called in the Council for the reformation of the Church in ‘head and members.’ No one was more shocked at the prevalent immorality, or more honestly anxious to correct it ; but it must not be supposed that the Chancellor of the University had any, even the slightest, sympathy with the reformation in doctrine then being advocated by John Hus and Jerome of Prague. On the contrary, he was one of their most pronounced opponents, and probably welcomed with satisfaction their terrible fate. The decree of the University of Paris signed by him ran :—

‘Our sentence is that the articles above mentioned are notoriously heretical, and that a heresy so scandalous ought straightway to be rooted out for fear lest the world should become infected by it. For though there appears in them a zeal against the vices of the prelates, which of a truth are but too great and too manifest, it is a zeal without knowledge. One cannot correct vice by vice, nor error by error, as devil does not cast out devil, but only by the Spirit of God.’<sup>3</sup>

The opinions of Gerson as to the relation of popes and councils had been all-powerful at Constance, but it was not so with another matter in which he was deeply interested.

<sup>1</sup> Gersonii *Opera*, ii. 201-9.

<sup>2</sup> Lenfant, *Concile de Constance*, ii. 91.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 193.  
FF 2

It is not necessary here to relate the murder of the Duke of Orleans by the Duke of Burgundy, or of the defence set up for the act by Jean Petit, a Franciscan friar. This had been condemned by the University of Paris and by a synod held in Paris; but Gerson, who had been the chief opponent of the doctrine of Jean Petit, was anxious to obtain the sentence of the Council in support of the French condemnation. This the Duke of Burgundy was as anxious to prevent, and his influence with the Council was very great. Nothing can, perhaps, better illustrate the debased morality of the prelates of that day than the way in which this attempt of Gerson was treated. Every sort of influence was brought to bear to prevent the condemnation. The same set of men who supported the violation of plighted faith in order to burn a man for what they called heresy, who voted for the denial of the cup to the laity, and evaded every proposition for disciplinary reform, now practically voted in support of murder, refusing to condemn the doctrines of Jean Petit save in one proposition, and attempting to bring ruin upon the upright Chancellor Gerson by trumped-up charges of heresy and false teaching. However much Gerson's soul may have been refreshed by the deposition of the popes, the proceedings of the Council in this matter must have cut him to the quick, and in fact the termination of his public life was brought about by it. Knowing well the danger from the bitter and unscrupulous enmity of the assassinating Duke of Burgundy, he did not venture to return to France at the conclusion of the Council. The Duke of Bavaria gave him an asylum for a time, and he might have had the highest scholastic position had he pleased to go to Vienna. But this did not accord with the character of his mind, which was contemplative and mystical. To have free scope for his spiritual thoughts and feelings he sought a different sphere, more suitable for their indulgence. He went to Lyons to the Convent of the Celestines, of which his brother Nicholas was the prior (1419). Here he passed ten years in retirement, and in the composition of those mystical and religious works which form so large a portion of his voluminous writings. But this was not his only, nor indeed his chief, occupation in his retirement. 'Undeceived,' says M. Schmidt, 'by the Councils of Pisa and Constance, and expecting nothing more from the hierarchy, all his hope and all his care were turned towards the people; for what end would be served by the reform of the clergy, so long as the people should remain in ignorance and check all improvements by their vices? It

was  
purify  
mingl  
in wh  
great  
deman  
preach  
with t  
and re  
had fo  
was th  
and fa  
virtue  
needs  
depart  
young  
to the  
to con  
them.  
young  
celebra  
myster  
scholar  
the lit  
to Jes  
practic  
youth.  
admir  
where  
Never  
pages  
book  
notice  
It  
Christ  
compe  
à Ken  
above  
bring  
him in  
hundre  
is certa  
says v

1 'T  
277. S

was necessary to begin with the people. It was necessary to purify this mass in which so many impure elements were mingled; it was necessary to kindle a light in this darkness in which slavery held men fast. This, then, was one of the great occupations of his life. Not content with constantly demanding that to the people should be given virtuous preachers, well instructed and enlightened, he himself preaches with that eloquence which springs from profound convictions, and recalls his hearers of all ranks to the duties which they had forgotten, 'Repent ye, and believe the Gospel.' This was the theme of most of his popular sermons—repentance and faith. These, in his eyes, were the commencement of all virtue, the conditions of all reform. And divining the true needs of his epoch, or rather of all time, he places the point of departure of intellectual progress in the education of the young. The latter years of the life of Gerson were devoted to these causes. As the Lord said, 'Suffer the little children to come unto Me,' so did he delight to be in the midst of them. What a touching sight was it to see him who as a young man had given instruction with so much *éclat* in the celebrated University of Paris—who had spoken there of the mysteries and the duties of the spiritual life in the presence of scholars from all nations—now in his old age surrounded by the little children of the people, leading them by gentle words to Jesus Christ their Saviour, and thus himself putting in practice the rules which he had given to teachers in his youth. Never does Gerson appear to us more worthy of admiration than in this obscure school of a suburb of Lyons, where he remained concealed for the remainder of his life. Never did he write anything more beautiful than those simple pages on the way of bringing children to the Lord—a little book truly admirable and worthy of being recalled to the notice of our age.<sup>1</sup>

It was at this period of retirement and unpretending Christian work that Gerson is supposed by many to have composed the celebrated treatise usually attributed to Thomas à Kempis. M. Schmidt, from whom we have quoted the above eloquent estimate of Gerson's labours, is unable to bring himself to speak positively as to the claim made for him in this matter. The controversy has continued for two hundred years, and the general opinion of the Christian world is certainly opposed to the authorship of Gerson. M. Schmidt says very appositely:—

<sup>1</sup> 'Tractatus de Parvulis ad Christum trahendis,' Gersonii *Opera*, iii. 277. Schmidt, *Essai sur Gerson*, p. 89.

'Without doubt this book would be one of the fairest flowers in the glory of the Chancellor, but for his greatness he does not need that zeal for his memory should make us attribute to him that which appears to us to be the work of another. If Gerson did not write the *Imitation*, he was worthy of having composed it. Through all his life he strove to imitate his Master.'<sup>1</sup>

Any notice of Gerson would be incomplete which did not say something as to his connexion with the mystical theology. This subject engaged much of his thoughts, and was treated by him in several works.<sup>2</sup> But Gerson was no more a mystic proper, than any other writer who recognizes the claims and power of spiritual religion.

'He had no thought of rejecting dialectic methods in favour of contemplative spiritualism, though he exalted the communion of God through faith, and the inward experience of its enlightening and sanctifying power above the mere logical conception of Divine truth.'<sup>3</sup>

The special characteristic of the mystic is to set free the inward voice from all external or alien authority whatever. But Gerson utterly condemns this license, and claims their fitting place for dialectic reasoning and the authority of the Church; at the same time he holds the necessity of combining with these the true inward spiritual life. He is thus a spiritualistic writer rather than a mystic. The tone of his mind was eminently devout, and he realised more than most men of his age a true communion with God. That Gerson, with all his vast and exact learning and great eloquence, has been but little read and but little quoted, is due probably in great measure to the scholastic method of his treatises, and the affectation of stating and advocating the pro and the con, which bewilders and perplexes the ordinary reader. That the Church has not put the stamp of sainthood on one whose life throughout was passed on the very highest Christian level, is due no doubt to those views of his on papal authority which have never been very popular at Rome. But all who love to contemplate the exhibition of the purest Christian virtue, the most polished eloquence, the most complete mastery of every part of theology, together with the simplicity and tenderness of a child, may well turn the eye of affectionate reverence to the life and works<sup>4</sup> of the great Chancellor of Paris.

<sup>1</sup> Schmidt, *Essai sur Gerson*, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *Considerationes de Theologia Mystica, De Vita Spiritualis Anima*, &c.

<sup>3</sup> *History of Christian Church*, by P. Smith, p. 567.

<sup>4</sup> Gerson's works have been admirably edited by Dr. Du Pin in an edition of five folio volumes.

AR

1. Op

2. L'

3. TH

4. TH

5. TH

6. L'

7. L'

8. C

WH

well v

Cand

for th

the fa

to sho

of his

trover

great

tende

forme

optim

a fair

pessin

the w

a well

age, i

copy

it, bei

to res

## ART. XI.—OPTIMISTIC FLAWS IN MODERN THOUGHT.

1. *Optimismus und Pessimismus: der Gang der christlichen Welt- und Lebensansicht.* Von Dr. W. GASS. (Berlin, 1876.)
2. *L'Evolution des Mondes et des Sociétés.* Par F. CAMILLE DREYFUS, Député de la Seine, Secrétaire général de la Grande Encyclopédie. (Paris, 1888.)
3. *The Factors of Organic Evolution.* By HERBERT SPENCER. (London, 1888.)
4. *The Optimism of Ralph Walter Emerson.* By WILLIAM F. DANA. (Boston, 1886.)
5. *The Pleasures of Life.* By Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., LL.D. (London, 1887.)
6. *L'Arte di esser felici.* Di PAOLO MANTEGAZZA. (Firenze, 1886.)
7. *L'Evolution Economique du Dix-neuvième Siècle: Théorie du Progrès.* Par M. G. DE MOLINARI, Membre correspondant de l'Institut. (Paris, 1880.)
8. *Civilization and Progress.* By JOHN BEATTIE CROZIER. New edition. (London, 1888.)

WHAT is optimism? 'It is the rage to maintain that all is well when one is ill at ease.' Such is the answer given by Candide to his servant in Voltaire's well-known story, written for the purpose of casting ridicule on the *Théodicée* of Leibnitz, the father of optimism; for in that work Leibnitz endeavoured to show that ours is the best of worlds. Did the greatest wit of his time, though by no means the most scrupulous of controversialists, succeed in demolishing the arguments of the great precursor of 'evolutionary optimism'? The pessimistic tendencies of the times, to which we called attention in a former paper, might lead us to suppose so. But the 'wicked optimism' of Leibnitz, as Schopenhauer calls it, still exists in a fairly well-preserved condition in spite of its struggle with pessimism for the last hundred years. Only the other day the writer of this paper received a letter from a literary friend, a well-known author, in full sympathy with the 'spirit of the age,' in which his correspondent refuses to part with a certain copy of Leopardi's poems on the ground that he cannot spare it, being his constant *vade mecum* and indispensable companion to restore his balance of mind whenever it oscillates, as it does



without ceasing, towards a 'truculent optimism.' We confess to a similar weakness ourselves, so that in our strictures on some forms of modern optimism it must not be supposed for a moment that we are inclining towards the side of pessimism. Our real aim is to hold the balance between these two opposite extremes, and, on the principle of *audi alteram partem*, to give full weight to the arguments of either. In our endeavour to point out the excesses of pessimism we were often reminded, as no doubt were some of our readers, of errors in an opposite extreme which it would not be well to overlook. These were reserved for separate treatment. We will point out some flaws in modern scientific optimism, both in its materialistic and pantheistic tendencies, and some fallacies in political and economic optimism as well: the 'sated optimism' of those who look upon the social world through the well-polished spectacles of self-satisfied respectability, imagining all is well in this best of worlds because all is well with our own dear selves; and the 'Utopian optimism' of world-improvers—Sir Thomas More's Utopia bore the title *De Optimo Reipublicæ Statu, deque nova insula Utopia*—who feel assured that all will be for the best in the commonwealth reformed or reconstructed according to their own particular plan. And in doing so we shall not confine ourselves to negative criticisms, but show how a careful study of the subject leads up to a purer form of 'transcendental optimism,' which alone affords a solution of the last problems of life. Christian optimism, without relying on *a priori* arguments concerning the pre-established harmony of things, endeavours nevertheless to reconcile the apparent contradictions of existence, and finds comfort and consolation in the belief of a harmonious development of all things in accordance with a Divine plan partly revealed to us now, whilst it rests satisfied with the promise of future enlightenment on obscure orderings of social Providence in the words of Christ addressed to St. Peter: 'Thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter' (St. John xiii. 7).

It has been remarked that pessimism precedes optimism as a mood of thought, and the literature of the world bears witness to the truth of this assertion. Perhaps it is because second thoughts are best, and that after a season of melancholy reverie the mind, on further reflection, reverts to brighter views of life. The danger is lest at this turning-point from melancholy to cheerful views of life we may turn the corner a trifle too quickly and so lose our mental equilibrium. Such was the case with Leibnitz and the naturalistic optimists at

the c  
of the

Pr  
this p  
merits  
the C  
them  
influe  
life in  
world  
prese  
forme  
*dysch*  
more  
stanc  
entire  
never  
then  
herse  
lenis  
of L  
balan  
spirit  
the  
was t  
had  
hum  
'the  
comp  
sing  
expo  
inint  
I  
are a  
indu

But  
prel  
selv

1  
Dép  
Préf  
2

the close of the seventeenth century, and such, too, is the danger of the present day, and for similar reasons.

Professor Gass, whose work we have placed at the head of this paper, points out the importance of measuring the relative merits and moral motives of optimism and pessimism from the Christian point of view. This he attempts to do in treating them historically, and, in so doing, shows how far they have influenced the development of religious thought and Church life in giving tone and colouring to religious views of the world and human life from the rise of Christianity up to the present day. He points out at the same time that views thus formed under the predominating influence of *eucholic* and *dyscholic* expressions of thought prevalent at the time, and more or less resulting from prevailing conditions and circumstances, never led the Church, as a whole, to be carried away entirely by the one or the other, so that in the dark ages she never yielded to the wistful gloom of Oriental thought, which then most attracted ideally disposed minds, nor yet allowed herself to be satisfied with the blithe cheerfulness of Hellenism in the palmy days of the Renaissance. Still the case of Leibnitz shows how difficult it is to maintain this mental balance. Even his powerful mind was unable to resist the spirit of the age, being then big with hopes of the future at the spring-tide of a great revolution, 'gros de l'avenir.' It was the age of Newton and of Locke, when natural discoveries had produced the same effect on the students of nature and human affairs as now, when there are those who see in matter 'the promise and potency of all terrestrial life,' whilst others, comprehending the natural synthesis of all existence under a single formula, are ready to agree in the dictum of a recent exponent of evolutionary optimism: 'L'évolution est fatale, ininterrompue et progressive.'<sup>1</sup>

It is true we, living at the close of the nineteenth century, are apt to look upon the world as *gros du passé* rather, and to indulge in retrospective self-congratulations, apt

'To see how wise men thought in olden time,

And how far we outstep their march in knowledge.'<sup>2</sup>

But though in so doing we sometimes look forward with apprehension, the more sanguine amongst us comfort themselves with the thought that, since we have got so far in our

<sup>1</sup> *L'Evolution des Mondes et des Sociétés.* Par Camille Dreyfus, Député de la Seine, Secrétaire général de la Grande Encyclopédie, Préface, p. v.

<sup>2</sup> Goethe's *Faust*, Anster's translation, p. 35.

modern progress, believing as we do in the uniformity of Nature's laws, why not go on with still mightier strides in the future to compass universal happiness on a uniform plan of procedure? <sup>1</sup> If there have been, as pessimists believe, disappointments in connexion with that revolution which Leibnitz only saw rising, and if the sediment left on our shores be not pleasant to the view, still less the prospect of another revolutionary wave looming at a distance, but drawing nearer with every hour, optimists are not disheartened thereby, whilst obstacles and difficulties for them are only further incitements to pursue the path of progress. Looking back on past disappointments they console themselves with the thought that the experiences of the past may help us to avert submersion by the revolutionary wave of the future by taking precautionary measures beforehand, as the Dutch do, by means of dykes and dams preserving the country from inundation. Up, then, they say, and let us conquer the world! such are the sentiments even of pessimists like Hartmann and other believers in 'transcendental realism.' Such, too, are the sentiments of thoughtful men who would be optimists if they could, like Sir John Lubbock and the Italian psychologist Paolo Mantegazza, whose aim is to fortify their own minds and those of their readers against the morbid tendency of giving way to melancholy reflections by means of propounding sage advice on the duty of happiness and the happiness of duty. Not only hedonistic utilitarianism, but a sad kind of scientific meliorism finds comfort in the thought of

'Myriads of little joys that ripen sweet  
And soothe the sorrowful spirit of the world,  
Groaning and travelling with the painful birth  
Of slow redemption.'<sup>2</sup>

Leibnitz's view of development was dynamical as opposed to that of Descartes, his rival, which was mechanical, though both were believers in a Divine power originating and sustaining all things. Our modern thinkers endeavour to combine both views, but practically eliminate the factor of original design and continued direction by a Divine hand. According to some of our optimistic scientists not only 'tout va bien' in this best of worlds, but all goes on of its own accord without Divine intervention. 'Le monde va de lui-même.' As to the spiritual forces behind the visible mechanism, Mr. Huxley,

<sup>1</sup> See *Die Weltanschauungen Leibnitz' und Schopenhauer's*, &c., von George Jellinek, Wien, 1872, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> George Eliot's *Spanish Gypsy*, book v. p. 363, 5th edition, 1869.

speak  
agn  
in w  
mina  
grace  
excit  
indee  
sad r  
expo  
I  
mind  
ham  
soph  
comp  
writt  
year  
risti  
this  
ques  
argu  
four  
in t  
and  
argu  
and  
with  
con  
Pop  
Mir  
only  
whi  
if w

do  
like  
to a  
anc  
pro  
som  
alw  
of

For  
of  
p.

speaking in the name of modern science, falls back on the agnostic formula 'Ignoramus et ignorabimus;' but this view, in which Nature is likened by J. S. Mill to a richly-illuminated missal, written in an unknown tongue, where the graceful forms of letters and the beauty of colouring may excite wonder, but where the true meaning is little known, if, indeed, there is any meaning to decipher, is apt to make us sad rather than optimistic, after the manner of the most recent exponents of 'scientific progress.'<sup>1</sup>

It is curious how in this kind of speculation the human mind repeats itself. The Pope Commemoration at Twickenham on the last day of July reveals a similar wave of philosophic optimism, of which so unhappy a man as Pope was compelled to become the exponent. The *Essay on Man* was written under Bolingbroke's influence, and this within twenty years of the *Essais de Théodicée* and Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, to maintain the optimistic thesis that all is right in this best of worlds. It is an attempt to solve the great question of the hour whether the constitution of the world is an argument in favour of the goodness of God. The titles and four divisions of the essay cover the whole ground taken up in the controversy between modern optimism and pessimism, and by way of pointing out the analogy we may select the argument of the first epistle, which is entitled 'Of the Nature and State of Man with respect of the Universe.' What follows, with slight alterations, really corresponds with the plea of contemporary writers on natural theology. They too, like Pope, advocate submission of the finite reason to a higher Mind whilst inculcating belief in progressive development, now only in part understood in view of well-known facts and factors which seem to make against an optimistic view of the universe if we are satisfied with a purely naturalistic explanation of it.

Now, if we turn to the writings of modern evolutionists we do not find any such misgivings. Mr. Herbert Spencer, unlike some of his most optimistic followers, nowhere professes to account for the cosmos 'by the continuous action of physical and natural principles *alone*.' Still, as in the case of his latest production on the factors of organic evolution, as well as in some of his earlier books, whenever he speaks of forces he always means natural forces, and only admits the possibility of spiritual forces behind them in the region of the Unknow-

<sup>1</sup> See *The Progress of Science* from 1836 to 1888, by Grant Allen; *Fortnightly Review*, June 1887; and 'A Survey of Fifty Years' Progress of Science,' by Mr. Huxley, in Ward's *Reign of Queen Victoria*, vol. ii. p. 368 and *passim*.

able. But then Divine energy, taken in the singular or the plural, like divinities 'sitting far withdrawn upon the heights of space,' affords but slight comfort to sublunary beings puzzled by the problems of existence, since 'the Power which the universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable.' Granted the truth of the theory of 'continuous evolution'—and we have no intention whatever to call it in question—given 'the origin and development of all organic forms by accumulated modifications naturally caused' by 'inheritance of fortuitous variations,' as the 'direct effects of the medium on the first forms of life;' this primordial factor, together with any other natural factors co-operating in organic evolution and producing the various gradations of organization through 'transmitted structures of type,' give no explanation as to the nature and origin of the 'primordial units' themselves. Nor do they hold out any expectation that, in view of the uniformity of Nature's laws, there ever will come a time when the price now paid for natural selection and the survival of the fittest, by which the progressive movement of the whole is conditioned, *i.e.* the ruined lives and hopes of those who succumb in the struggle for existence, will no more be required. Thus the limits of knowledge as to the ultimate date of science, and the limitations to happiness in the universe, as at present constituted, are so many flaws in the shining marble of the solid body of science, and so many faults in the stratified formations of human life and happiness. These are too many breaks in the continued line through the ages of human existence to admit of a complete system of scientific optimism—that is, if positive science has the last word to say on the whence and the whither of existence—and, as Mr. Crozier, in his work on *Progress and Civilization*, points out, 'there is no security for future advances in the scale of being, except on one condition, and that is, that we underpin the laws of evolution with religion' (p. 267).

If, moreover, it be recollected that dissolution 'undoes what evolution has done,' and that as far as our own earth is concerned 'dissolution must eventually arrive,' when all things which have thus far proceeded on a happy-go-lucky optimist train will come to a stillstand, and life become extinct on the globe, the natural reflection which will occur to the mind of the most obdurate optimist will be, to use the words of the greatest pleasure-loving people of Europe, 'Cela va bien pourvu que cela dure.' But, if not? The very thought dwelt on in imagination of a time coming when the sun's rays come in diminished force to give light to the earth, ending at

last  
in th  
apar  
conf  
men  
Mill  
schw  
have  
mus  
eter  
hap  
'acc  
life  
whic  
mat

and  
idea  
que  
plic  
the  
nat  
be  
pur  
on  
of  
Str  
exp  
'N  
Em  
We  
mis  
'M  
and  
sat  
sop  
tha  
cha  
thi

con  
arr

Ess

last in cold and death, is apt to produce a lower temperature in the climate of opinion where optimism flourishes. Quite apart from the darker problems of actual physical evil which confront us on every side, and which have affected so painfully men differing from each other as much as De Maistre and Mill,<sup>1</sup> the further progress of science since the period of 'Natur-schwärmerei' and 'Aufklärung' of a century ago ought to have taught a sounder optimism. At all events thus much must be admitted, that although 'the aggregate of fixed eternal circumstances makes in itself to some extent for our happiness,' yet, on the other hand, there are many so-called 'accidental hindrances' and 'unpredictable contingencies of life' militating considerably against the pursuit of happiness, which renders an unqualified profession of optimism on purely materialistic grounds impossible.<sup>2</sup>

But we have been of late congratulated on the disappearance of materialism and the restoration of 'spirituality'—i.e. ideal views of the universe as a whole—especially in consequence of modern scientific conceptions of cosmic unity implied in the evolution theory. Thus when we are offered by the author of *Natural Religion*, by way of substitute for supernatural religion, a 'religion of material things,' we find it to be an etherialized worship of Nature and the beautiful, 'a purified worship of natural forms,' bearing some resemblance on one side to the soft and smooth intellectual Epicureanism of Mr. Pater, and to the rationalistic theosophy of David Strauss on the other. But perhaps its best and most popular expression is to be found in Emerson's *Idealistic Pantheism*. 'Nature with Emerson,' says Mr. Dana in his little book on *Emerson's Optimism*, 'was all good, if man would simply obey. We here, then, have Emerson's grounds, system even, of optimism.' He quotes a letter to Carlyle, in which Emerson says, 'My whole philosophy, which is very real, teaches acquiescence and optimism.' But his optimism is not the commonplace satisfaction with material things, the bread-and-butter philosophy of the modern Philistine, sharing the view of Pangloss that, since 'le château de M. le baron était le plus beau des châteaux et madame la meilleure des baronnes possibles,' ergo this must be the best of worlds.

Against such and similar exhibitions of egotistical self-complacency and optimistic self-satisfaction Emerson is up in arms. He cannot tolerate the love of 'splendid materiality'

<sup>1</sup> See *The Problem of Evil*, by E. Naville, pp. 54, 55; Mill's *Three Essays on Religion*, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Pessimism*, by James Sully, pp. 339-41, 351-4.



and the vulgar pride in what he calls 'corporeal civilization.' The universe to him is the 'externalization of soul,' and accordingly he looks on all things with that second sight of the mind which is ever 'disclosing its deeper holdings in the frame of things; in other words, he lives in a spiritualized universe of his own, and so to him life may be lyric or epic, as well as a poem or a romance,' *i.e.* after the restoration of that spirituality which we have lost awhile in this age of mechanical contrivances for the attainment of the materialistic *summum bonum*. Thus he paves the way to that confluence of religious and scientific optimism in modern thought to which attention was drawn by Mr. Symonds in his well-known essay on the 'Progress of Thought in our Time' in the *Fortnightly Review* for June 1887:—

'The tendency of scientific ideas, in so far as these are remoulding thought in these high regions, is to spiritualize religion, to dissipate the materialistic associations which environ theology in its mythological stages, and to emancipate the individual from egotism face to face with that universal Being of which he is part and to the manifestation of which he contributes' (p. 892).

'The conceptions of God's law tend to coalescence in the scientific theory of the universe. In other words, spirituality is restored to Nature, which comes to be regarded as a manifestation of infinite vitality' (*ibid.*)

Hence

'Nothing can come amiss to those who have brought their wills and wishes into accord with universal order. This will be stigmatised as optimism. . . . Religion has been always optimistic, and whatever science is it certainly is not pessimistic' (p. 895).

On the practical side the resultant of such aspects of Nature and God is summarized in the often-quoted expression of Goethe: 'Im Ganzen, Guten, Schönen, resolut zu leben' ('To live resolutely in the whole, the good, and the beautiful'). But the incompleteness of the whole, as seen by us, is a barrier to speculative optimism; the conscious imperfection in following after that which is good, which proves fatal to moral optimism; and the sense of the unattainable in the highest realms of art,—were these not felt by Goethe himself, in spite of his grand capacity for calm and unceasing effort in moral culture and the pursuit of cultured or æsthetic optimism? Is not the partial failure of his own attempt recorded in the second part of *Faust*, ending as it does, and ending as he intended it should do, with a confession of man's inability to realize the ideal in art and nature, and in the art of life? 'This,' he said,

'was  
we ca  
adde  
purer  
above  
disco  
aims  
from  
of lite  
ingne  
quali  
rest  
with  
vulga  
of the  
the o  
optim  
tende  
of bi  
the f  
spirit  
refini  
Hutt  
Guid  
buoy  
throv  
from  
T  
hilar  
but c  
differ  
We  
unio  
is inc  
optim  
anot  
regio  
mod  
All  
arisi  
1  
Harn  
2  
Hutt  
Mode  
scept

'was quite in accordance with our religious conception that we cannot be saved through our own power, but through the added grace of God; hence in *Faust* an ever higher and purer activity to the end with additional help descending from above in eternal love.'<sup>1</sup> Similar feelings, expressing a Divine discontent with our performances as compared with our high aims in the region of thought and action alike, are reflected from the noblest works of modern minds in every department of literature, science, and art. This insufficiency and unsufficiency felt by the finest minds is a direct negative to unqualified optimism. Meaner and commonplace minds may rest satisfied: not so minds of the highest order, possessed with the noblest ideas; they cannot be satisfied with the vulgar optimisms of ignoble mediocrity. Hence the aim of the highest form of poetry, as Von Hartmann remarks on the optimism in the *Faust*, and as others have noted on the optimism of tragedy generally, is the effort to produce elegiac tenderness as the compensation for frustrated attempts, a sort of bitter-sweet subdued feeling of resigned sadness rising in the finest forms of tragedy from dejection to that liberation of spirit which is capable of high suffering, and rises through the refining processes of sorrow to joyous performance. Mr. Hutton has pointed out a similar intention in *Some Modern Guides of English Thought* to stimulate and arouse 'a new buoyancy,' 'the natural buoyancy of the renouncing heart,' in throwing off the weight of melancholy reflections and to escape from 'the cloud of mortal destiny.'

This, he points out, is Matthew Arnold's secret of 'exhilaration,' i.e. a cheerfulness which is anything but optimistic, but only an attempt to make the best of things, which is a very different matter from believing that this is the best of worlds. We conclude, then, that a spiritualized view of nature and a union of science and religion in a vaguely idealistic pantheism is incapable of producing in the highest minds a complete optimistic view of things as they are.<sup>2</sup> Here, then, we have another flaw in modern optimism, especially in the rarefied regions of highest thought, among the most eminent of modern interpreters of nature and revealers of life's secret. All give expression to that regretful feeling of resignation arising from a deep sense of man's incompetency in tracing

<sup>1</sup> *Goethe in der Epoche der Vollendung* (1805-32), von Dr. Otto Harnack, p. 28 and ante.

<sup>2</sup> See *Essays on Modern Guides of English Thought*, by R. H. Hutton, pp. 112-14, 141, 142; and compare *Ethics and Aesthetics of Modern Poetry*, by J. R. Selkirk, pp. 9, 10, and 145, on the influence of scepticism on poetry.

'The ways of fate ; for how can these be traced,  
That in the life omnipotent lie based ?  
Or earth-grown atom's bounded soul  
Grasp the universal whole ?'<sup>1</sup>

If it be said, Leave the poets and philosophers to look on the actual life of man and 'the state of man with respect to society,' we are impelled in the next place to examine the claims of 'the social happiness' principle. This, briefly stated, consists in the belief that there is a way of harmonizing the best interests of the individual with social development in the fulfilment of social duty, that there is no greater happiness than the bliss of dutiful obedience to social laws, including 'the joy of dutiful renouncement.' This is the modern version of utilitarian opportunism, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number,' as modified by the recent teachings of social evolution. This optimistic creed has been in vogue ever since the days of Adam Smith, and has been of late ably restated in Mr. Crozier's volume on *Civilization and Progress*, closing with a full belief in the future, when

'science, by diving into the deep elements of the problem—material and social—and ascertaining the physical and spiritual laws on which it depends, will, by again enabling us to *equalize* the conditions, prepare the way for a new and higher social régime than any that history has yet recorded.'

Similar, and resting on similar grounds, were the hopes of the Economists at the close of the last century, believing with Adam Smith in 'the natural progress of opulence,' depending 'on the natural effort of every individual to better his own condition when suffered to exert himself with freedom and security.' But there is this difference, that the social problem now stares us in the face which did not then exist, or even was dreamt of, but has been evolved from the very conditions here described, *i.e.* unlimited individual liberty and expansion.

We, therefore, are often now invited to put our faith in 'the gradual *amelioration* of the material and social conditions of men,' since the 'evolution of happiness' is made contingent on 'scientific meliorism.' Economic optimism, therefore, to be complete must take in the future as well as the present, and therefore as far as the present is concerned it is not and, as we shall show, cannot be a whole-hearted optimism, in spite of the cheerful assurances of the crowd of *laudatores temporis acti* who have not sufficient penetration, or integrity of mind, to perceive this. But even a hasty glance at the

<sup>1</sup> T. Woolner, *My Beautiful Lady*. London, 1863.

opt  
this.  
of g  
their  
serio  
our  
for w  
Mech  
devel  
mate  
his r  
grow  
our e

A  
so-ca  
crats  
is re  
prove  
Ther  
The  
The  
its op  
has b  
gold,  
and f  
in all  
miser  
and  
only  
labou  
of d  
'this  
the  
grow  
and t  
minu  
panie  
facto  
those

1  
Prof.  
Giffen  
Engla  
Comm  
tone  
Octob  
VO

optimistic literature of the Jubilee year is sufficient to show this. For even those writers who were selected for the task of giving a 'survey of fifty years' progress,' on account of their optimistic proclivities, tell us that it affords matter of serious reflection, warning us to be sober-minded in reviewing our past achievements, whilst we are none the less thankful for what advance has been made in more than one direction. Mechanical inventions for saving labour and a marvellous development of industrial machinery have vastly increased material wealth, but, as the late Professor Leone Levi reminds his readers whilst presenting them with a glowing picture of growing prosperity, it 'is by no means all gold that glitters in our economic system.'<sup>1</sup>

According to the laws of 'superorganic evolution'—the so-called natural laws of political economy which the physiocrats of a hundred years ago promulgated in France—all that is required was stated to be this: Let each man try to improve his own condition, 'et le monde alors va de lui-même.' Therefore 'Laissez faire, laissez aller!' and all will go well. The principle has been tried for a century, with what results? The doctrine of 'laissez faire' is discredited on all hands, and its opponents argue as follows: The number of millionaires has been increased, with the means of amassing mountains of gold, but with 'a new race of manufacturing plutocrats rising and falling like so many golden sandhills' there has risen up in all civilized and progressive countries a vast multitude of miserable starvelings, scarcely able to eke out bare existence, and among the mechanical discoveries of the age are not only machines which make mind unnecessary and manual labour cheap, but also 'infernal machines,' the invention of dynamite engines being one of the latest results of 'this age of progress,' intended in their way to hasten on the 'social improvement of the masses.' The marvellous growth of cities is accompanied by the evils of overcrowding and the dull depression of depopulated country districts. The minute division of labour in the centres of industry is accompanied by the concentration of the proletariat, drilled in factories and trained by agitators for common action against those whom their toil has enriched, whilst even 'subsistence

<sup>1</sup> 'The Material Growth of the United Kingdom from 1836 to 1886,' by Prof. Leone Levi, *Fortnightly Review*, June 1887, p. 914. In Mr. Giffen's latest utterance on the 'Recent Rate of Material Progress in England' and Prof. Levi's lecture in King's College on the 'Progress of Commerce and Industry,' both writers speak in a still more subdued tone of plutocratic optimism. See *Times*, September 2, 1887, and October 14, 1887.

wages' are rendered precarious by commercial fluctuations and consequent oscillations in the labour market, so as to render the basis of society in its lower layers ominously insecure.

These are some 'matters which may be fairly grouped under *that debatable word progress*'—so debatable that some even speak of it as an 'advance backwards.' We are not of this number; still the matter wears a serious aspect for would-be optimists.

Voltaire, in his *Candide*, referred to the earthquake of Lisbon to point out the flaws in the materialistic optimism of his own times. Sceptics nowadays might point to those social earthquakes in divers places, of which we hear so much now, as symptomatic of volcanic forces of social discontent underground, and as facts which cannot be reconciled with a profession of economic optimism. Leibnitz, optimist as he was, believed that the age he lived in was the old age of the world, and the bright future he predicted was the glow of sunset rather than of the rising dawn. Our modern optimists, so far from discovering any symptoms of senile decrepitude around them, believe, on the contrary, that we have only arrived at the earlier stage of social evolution, that existing social phenomena are only the beginnings of a 'fuller industrial and social development.' A change of tenses is enough to distinguish the optimism of the nineteenth from that of the eighteenth century. Thus Pope said, and the world tried hard to believe, that 'whatever is, is right.' Now we are told, 'Whatever is, is well; but nothing really is which is not in progressive and *militant* movement.' But 'militant movement' is the very phrase which suggests the difficulty which our modern prophets of smooth things have to get over, and sometimes try to glose over, and not always very successfully. For what is called the social movement is nothing else but the 'militant movement' of a certain class to gain the necessary advantages in order to its own higher social development, that class being the most numerous and able by force of numbers to give effect to its demands at the ballot-box. This is the social problem how to reconcile the rise of democracy with social conditions resting on aristocratic institutions. This is the great question which taxes the ingenuity of the politician and the political economist alike, the one accentuating the functions of government in social legislation, the other accepting the forces of social life as such to work out in the natural course of things a social evolution. Both progressive statesmen and economists demand nothing else but 'the elevation and expansion of the individual;' but indi-

vidual  
'symm  
tion; a  
lution  
libertie  
the Fre  
of the la  
about  
of reas  
bonds  
the clos  
close o  
masses,  
authori  
return  
anarchy  
whilst  
these a  
practica  
in their  
with fre  
ment w

We  
optimis  
reforma  
cover t  
And in  
living p  
sentativ  
the two

The  
party p  
which  
nounce  
buted t  
'Locks  
against  
Poet L  
in which

'Gone  
Lost,

Mr.  
achiever  
conclusi

vidual expansion may, in its centrifugal effects, endanger the 'symmetry and stability of society'; it may produce a revolution; and so Karl Marx and his school predict the social revolution from the effects of this actual 'expansion' of individual liberties and the reign of competition since the outbreak of the French Revolution, which rendered all equal in the eyes of the law, but has, by reason of unlimited competition, brought about greater inequalities, less bearable than ever in 'the age of reason' and universal liberty. In the bursting of social bonds and setting free of individual effort, the revolution at the close of the eighteenth century began—while that at the close of the nineteenth will finish—the emancipation of the masses, or the fourth estate. Hence, say the upholders of authority and order, clinging with tenacity to the past, let us return to hierarchical institutions to prevent liberty ending in anarchy; 'the old is best.' Theirs is a retrogressive optimism, whilst that of the former is a progressive optimism. Between these are the reforming school of political economists and the practical social reformers, taking for their basis Christian ethics in their endeavour to reconcile liberty with authority, order with freedom, combining 'an ardent interest in human improvement with a reasoned attention to the law of its conditions.'

We may, in conclusion, glance at these various forms of optimism, progressive and retrogressive, revolutionary and reformatory, to see what truth they contain, and also to discover the flaws, or more serious fallacies, involved in each. And in the first place we would consider the optimism of a living politician and of a living economist as two typical representatives of the progressive school of political economists in the two most progressive countries of Western Europe.

The political optimism of Mr. Gladstone—irrespective of party politics, in which we are not here concerned, and on which the present writer has no wish or authority to pronounce an opinion—finds its expression in an article contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* for January 1887, entitled 'Locksley Hall and the Jubilee.' It is mainly directed against the corrections of a more youthful optimism by the Poet Laureate in his *New Locksley Hall*, sixty years after, in which he takes a gloomier view of the 'age of progress':—

'Gone the cry of Forward! forward! lost within a growing gloom;  
Lost, or only heard in silence from the silence of the tomb.'

Mr. Gladstone's argument is based on the legislative achievements of the past fifty years, and he comes to the conclusion that 'the laws and works of the half-century he



reviews are not bad, but good.' We are obliged, by-the-bye, to Mr. Gladstone for the optimistic view he expresses of the clergy of the Anglican Church, 'who have not been merely improved, but transformed,' during that period. It may be that, owing to this fact, 'the duties of wealth to poverty, of strength to weakness, of knowledge to ignorance, in a word, of man to man,' have been more thoroughly realized, and 'that the public conscience has grown more tender.' But, whilst there can be no denying that there has been advance all along the line, there are those who might retort, All is good, but it might be better; and an optimist cannot be satisfied with anything but what is *best*. Even Mr. Gladstone finds it necessary to strike a note of warning in this very article:—

'Let us be jealous of plutocracy and of its tendency to infect aristocracy, its elder and nobler sister; and learn, if we can, to hold by or get back to some regard for simplicity of life. Let us respect the ancient manners, and recollect that if the true soul of chivalry has died among us, with it all that is good in society has died.'

Those who most readily will agree with this sentiment may refuse to endorse the optimist views of the writer as a whole. To the assertion that 'we have lived in a gentle time' in consequence of legislative progress, they may ask in return whether it is owing to the gentler virtues of capitalists, or the gentle tones of Trafalgar Square orators in their soft impeachment of the *bourgeoisie*, that the 'forces of civilization' are called into requisition. They might feel inclined to inquire whether this is not an illustration of the truth that language is modified by social changes, a phrase of this kind being coined to disguise the fact that even the progressive society of the nineteenth century requires weapons of defence peculiar to a ruder age, though it is better policy to call them by a finer name. We might quote passages from the works of American and Australian writers on the social conditions of the New World to show, in spite of the optimistic tendencies of the authors, that neither 'the aggrandisement and national perfection of Great Britain,' nor 'triumphant democracy' across the Atlantic, nor even 'popular government' at the Antipodes has proved an infallible organon as yet for the promotion of complete social happiness, on the principle laid down by one of them 'that, in order to attain the largest amount of happiness, it is essential that we should possess the largest possible amount of liberty compatible with its like enjoyment by all.'

For  
this is  
and a  
of soc

'If  
their i  
their m  
less of  
will fin  
the mo  
been fo

Th  
sociali  
Times  
the rep

M.  
same  
his bo  
politic  
doubt  
and e  
govern  
economi  
looks  
enterp  
large  
highly  
mechan  
capital  
produc  
definit

Th  
new w  
manag  
of stri  
both o  
direct  
well a  
moth c

<sup>1</sup> See  
the Par  
<sup>2</sup> L  
p. 330, 2  
Beaulieu  
p. 407 e

For in the concluding words of the work from which this is taken the writer shows that the extension of liberty, and a liberal use of it by free citizens, is no guarantee even of social safety.

'If the enfranchised masses of European countries,' he says, 'from their incapacity to wield with judgment the legislative power which their mere numbers give them, and instead use that power, regardless of principle and with the brute force of which it is capable, they will find those whom they drag down with them ready converts to the more primitive method of contention, the resort to which will have been forced upon them in defence of their common liberties.'<sup>1</sup>

These are the last words of a Liberal Economist against socialism. In a similar threatening tone spoke the *Chicago Times* in November 1887 of 'grape shot for anarchists,' and the reply was given in the 'Chicago Riots.'

M. Molinari is an orthodox Political Economist of the same school, an economist rather than a politician, who, in his book on *Political Evolution and the Revolution*, describes politics as a superior branch of human industry, and he no doubt finds some living politicians in his own country—and elsewhere?—take the same view of the functions of government. But we are here concerned with his views on economic evolution, which are eminently optimistic. He looks forward hopefully to the final goal when all industrial enterprise shall be carried on by joint-stock companies on a large scale conjointly with workers banded together in highly-developed trades-unions, when in a perfectly adjusted mechanism, in which labour forms the natural pendant to capital, the undisturbed equilibrium of these two factors of production shall be restored and maintained *d'une manière définitive entre les entrepreneurs et les ouvriers*.<sup>2</sup>

The Descazeville strike in France, on which occasion the new word *watrinier*—derived from M. Watrin, the name of the manager who was trampled to death by the infuriated crowd of strikers—was coined, and the labour riots in Belgium, in both of which the organized trades-unions were put into direct antagonism with companies of this description, as well as the warfare within recent memory of the 'mammoth companies' of the United States with the most numer-

<sup>1</sup> See *Liberty and Liberalism*, by Bruce Smith, formerly Member of the Parliament of New South Wales, pp. 547, 683.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Evolution Economique du XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle: Théorie du Progrès*, p. 330, and ante, pp. 443-4; compare similar sentiments in Paul Leroy Beaulieu's *Le Collectivisme: examen critique du Nouveau Socialisme*, p. 407 et seq.

ous and most perfectly organized body of trades-unions in the world, the 'knights of labour,' are telling illustrations of the truths of this optimistic view of industrial development, ending in the final triumph of 'la grande industrie,' as here expressed by one of its most powerful advocates. M. Molinari admits some of the evils accompanying the growth and tendencies of modern industrialism, but these he ascribes to the feverish excitement of modern society, in its youth still, which will pass away with the maturity of manhood and old age. Solon's advice to Cræsus might not be out of place in such a case: 'Call no man happy before his death.' Socialists regard this tendency of modern industry, requiring colossal fortunes and driving out all small competitors, as a sign of social congestion, for which they predict an early death; whilst social reformers see in this form of industry, carried on by companies and syndicates, where moral and personal considerations are sacrificed to purely commercial or material objects, and where the relations of employers and employed are most unsatisfactory, the greatest danger to society; in fact, religious economists, like Charles Périn, see in it no less than *l'abîme de l'individualisme utilitaire*, the moral and social abyss in which individual selfishness has landed society.

To rescue it from this social abyss a body of Christian Socialists in France, called L'Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers, has formed itself into an association, whose programme consists in the attempt to bring about a counter-revolution, and to render nugatory some of the evil effects of unrestricted competition and the modern forms of industry as the economic effects of the revolution and 'la liberté du travail' which it inaugurated. Its object is 'to stem the tide of revolution,' to restore 'the rights of God' as against the 'rights of men,' and to reintroduce the form of industry under trade corporations which the revolution destroyed, and thus to redress the excesses of selfish industrialism—in short, to take up the work of social reform where it was interrupted by the Revolution a hundred years ago. This is the position taken up in a paper contained in the organ of the party under the title 'L'Action Sociale du Catholicisme et l'*Optimisme libéral*,' intended as a reply to M. le Comte d'Haussonville, who, in his book on *Combat contre la Misère*, had shown the impracticability of such an attempt of bringing back the social institutions of the past, whilst speaking most respectfully of the movement itself. At the present moment, and in anticipation of the centenary of the Revolution, a number of

arti-  
mitte  
same  
befor  
even  
antag  
to a  
the s  
in w  
of th  
a soc  
pora  
vadi  
cont  
antic  
dual  
ciati  
is th  
much  
prog  
little  
The  
enlig  
altru  
an e  
civil  
says  
in a  
(p. 4  
supp  
wou  
reorg  
fesso  
Ecol  
intel  
our  
latin  
our  
Wh  
thro  
not  
insp  
1

articles written and published under the direction of a sub-committee of the 'Œuvre,' make their appearance monthly in the same organ, to show, from the condition of French society before the outbreak of the Revolution and since, that that event was the parent of most of the existing social evils and antagonisms, and that the only hope of society is in a return to a form of industry similar to that which prevailed under the shadow of the mediæval Church before the Revolution, in which the patriarchal and communal interrelationships of the various ranks of workers and employers acted as a social cement. What is aimed at is a return to trade corporation in a modern garb, with the religious sentiments pervading the co-operating parties—in short, a return from contract to social status, with the authority of religion as an antidote against the anarchical tendencies of reckless individualism. The truth contained in the principles of this association, whatever may be thought of its reactionary tendencies, is this, that the future fate of humanity must depend, not so much on material and economic as on moral and spiritual progress, and that political and economic reforms can do little towards social regeneration without a 'moral revolution.' The ethics of the market do not produce anything better than enlightened egoism, whilst the materialistic basis of socialistic altruism aims no higher than a wider diffusion of pleasure in an earthly paradise. 'Let us preach the gospel of the new civilization, which is the realization of universal happiness,' says the author of *The True Solution of the Labour Question* in a tract forming part of the 'New York Labour Library' (p. 47).

Unless nobler ideals are aimed at and stronger motives supplied than these, the optimist hopes of social reformers would be reduced to a narrow compass. 'An economic reorganization of society,' to use the weighty words of Professor Ingram, the leader of the reforming school of Political Economists in this country, 'implies a universal renovation, intellectual and moral, no less than material . . . modifying our whole environment, affecting our whole culture, and regulating our whole conduct—in a word, consciously directing all our resources to the conservation and evolution of humanity.'<sup>1</sup> Whence may we expect this renovating power to come except through a wider diffusion of Christian ethics?

The Church in her relation to Modern Democracy, whilst not forgetting her spiritual solidarity with the past, must inspire and direct this new movement of the moral, as the

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopædia Brit.* 9th edit., *sub voce* 'Political Economy,' p. 401.

antecedent of social, amelioration. 'We see,' says one of the interlocutors in an imaginary dialogue on 'Political Optimism,'<sup>1</sup> contributed in the form of an article by Mr. Traill in the *Nineteenth Century* a few years ago—

'We see that political systems tend in all progressive societies towards Socialistic Democracy ; . . . we feel, too, that nothing we can do can avert, or possibly long delay, the consummation. . . . Well, then, I say, we *must* believe, whether with a theological or philosophical faith, that the movement is being guided, or is guiding itself, to happy issues, or we should be forced to throw up the political game in sheer blankness of despair.'

For us there is only one alternative, the faith that the movement is thus being guided aright, and in this way religion becomes a great spiritual reserve force in social evolution. But we must not expect this progress to be one which is nearing the goal by leaps and bounds. Canon Fremantle, in his interesting work on *The World as the Subject of Redemption*, being the Bampton Lectures for 1885, has drawn a fanciful ideal of a Christian world co-extensive with the Christian Church, in which 'the great and growing society of commerce becomes, therefore, like every other form of human society, a branch of the universal Church,' &c. (p. 320) ; whilst further on he says—

'Co-operative production still more may be looked upon as affording scope for the bringing of trade under the dominion of the Christian spirit ; for we can hardly imagine anything more nearly fulfilling the idea of a Church than a vast co-operative guild, inspired by the Christian spirit of mutual well-doing, with rulers and a brotherhood united in the work to which their lives and interests were devoted in common, and aiming, by the labour of all together, at the supply of the wants of all its members' (p. 348).

But this picture of a society fulfilling the common law of labour in 'a vast brotherhood of mutual beneficence' is, after all, nothing more than a fancy picture. 'The progress of co-operation' in this country, as we know from its latest reports, though a splendid success, is accompanied by 'the progress of *egoism* among co-operators.' But 'an organization of fraternity' demands a curbing of the selfish propensities, not their development ; nor should it be necessary for the veteran president of the Co-operative Congress, and the oldest survivor of the 'Christian Socialists,' in this year of grace 1888, to exhort his followers with the utmost solemnity :

<sup>1</sup> 'Political Optimism : a Dialogue,' by H. D. Traill, *Nineteenth Century*, August 1880, p. 304.

'Life  
may  
social  
opera  
trial  
cultie  
we m  
when  
the I  
sangu  
forge  
the so  
thing  
point  
*Essay*  
integ  
chang  
thus  
mank

T  
optim  
optim  
ment  
augu  
repla  
whom  
tion i  
are, c  
misar  
that  
tione  
phila  
Chris  
nor d  
think  
good  
time  
ment  
'And  
stand  
innoc  
happ

1 5  
prefac  
2 5

'Lift up your eyes from material things,' so that co-operation may 'rise from a disguise of self-interest into a principle of social duty.'<sup>1</sup> The progress made in moralizing even co-operative enterprise, as 'the commencement of a new industrial evolution,'<sup>2</sup> being thus slow and surrounded by difficulties, arising from the imperfect conditions of human nature, we must not be too eager in our reformatory optimism, even when it is founded on a belief in 'a more direct outpouring of the Divine vitality upon human organisms,' to see our most sanguine expectations immediately realized. Nor must we forget that incongruities, irregularities, and inconsistencies of the social, as of the individual life, are part of the order of things appointed by God for discipline. For, as Mozley pointed out more than fifty years ago in his well-known *Essay on Job*, they must be regarded as being in a measure an integral part of the supramundane system itself, undergoing changes appointed by the same Divine authority, and having thus a relatively permanent value in the Divine education of mankind.

Thus the higher eschatological hopes of transcendental optimism are calculated to supplant alike the false superficial optimism of minds too easily satisfied with the past achievements of humanity, and but too willing to see in them the augury of still greater triumphs in the future, and also to replace the unreasonable pessimism of those fretting minds whom the world has treated badly, or whose gloomy imagination inclines them to take a desponding view of things as they are, or even may be hereafter. Equally distant from that misanthropical pessimism which despairs of human nature, and that kind of good-natured, good-humoured, and good-intentioned optimism which tries to heal all social diseases by philanthropic lemonade, a philosophy of life founded on Christianity looks on the world neither through rose-hued nor darkened spectacles, but with the last words of the dying thinker Kant, himself often referred to as a pessimist, 'It is good,' accepts with gratitude what good there is, but at the same time remembers that the often-quoted text of the Old Testament—often quoted as the expression of Hebrew optimism—'And behold, it was very good' (Gen. i. 31), refers, where it stands, to a cosmological order in the state of primæval innocency. It strives to remove the obstacles to human happiness and progress, neither overrating nor undervaluing

<sup>1</sup> See *Report of the 19th Annual Co-operative Congress*, 1887, p. 13 and preface; and the *20th Report* for 1888, p. 10 and *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Fortnightly Review*, August 1887, pp. 165-9.



the efficacy of all methods for the improvement of human beings individually and in the aggregate. But this it does not in the spirit of believers in 'blindfold evolution,' whose sole aim is to eliminate evil and to foster good in the structure of a society which they believe already to be in course of decomposition,<sup>1</sup> and which may be called the optimism of sad resignation. Without leaning either towards prospective optimism or pessimism over much, having learned from the fallacies contained in either tendency the importance of keeping the eye steadily on facts, and carefully avoiding fanciful vagaries, the Christian philosopher yet hopes, in the endeavour to accomplish his own appointed task, to help in some degree in reducing 'the social chaos to universal harmony ;' remembering that there are what Mr. Ruskin calls 'the pleasures of faith,' as well as the 'pleasures of hope,' we may fulfil our own destiny, knowing that if we would in some measure 'taste the calm completion of content' in the divinely appointed process of the world, we must take for our guide the ethical paradox of the Apostle as the paradigm of life's moods and tenses : 'Sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.'

---

#### SHORT NOTICES.

1. *Dust. A Letter to the Rev. C. Gore, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House, Oxford, by the Rev. LUKE RIVINGTON, M.A., on his book, 'Roman Catholic Claims.'* (London : Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1888.)
2. *Some Remarks on 'Dust.'* By CHARLES GORE, M.A. (Oxford : B. H. Blackwell, 1888.)

THE two disputants whose polemical encounter we have recorded above (pp. 332-52) in our article upon the Roman Question, have since crossed weapons again. Mr. Rivington has published a rejoinder to Mr. Gore in a pamphlet entitled *Dust*, while Mr. Gore has published *Some Remarks on 'Dust'* as a surrejoinder. Mr. Rivington exhibits some smartness, even if he comes a little short of actual wit, in the reason he assigns for choosing his title : viz. that it is due to the coincidence of the same phrase being used by Mr. Gore and another critic of his book on *Authority*, that one of its statements was such as to make a man 'rub his eyes.' And he says that the only cause to which the

<sup>1</sup> See R. H. Hutton's article in *Contemporary Review* for April 1887, p. 484.

said process can be attributed is the eyes being full of dust thrown into them in the name of history. Neither pamphlet is furnished with a motto; and we offer Mr. Rivington 'Pulvis et umbra sumus' as a sufficiently appropriate one for his tractate, since it indicates at once the plurality of authorship and the part Mr. Rivington's name, as sole writer, really plays. For those who are versed in the Roman controversy can recognize at once that the pleas put forward both in *Authority* and the present publication belong to one specific school of Roman polemics, and are such as would all but certainly not have suggested themselves independently to Mr. Rivington's mind, even crediting him with the erudition (such as it is) which they display. Nor is it difficult to conjecture on what smith's anvil they were in fact forged. *Dust*, then, is thrown into the form of a letter to Mr. Gore on his book *Roman Catholic Claims*, and, after the bantering preface we have glanced at, proceeds to endeavour the disproof, or at least the minimizing, of three sections in that work, dealing severally with the works of Hippolytus, the Forged Decretals, and Anglican Jurisdiction. The gist of the first of these divisions of *Dust* is that Mr. Gore has been misled by the late Bishop Wordsworth's views upon Hippolytus, which have been disproved by Dr. Döllinger, and that consequently there is no likelihood that St. Francis de Sales or Sir Thomas More would have been affected by the *Refutatio* had it been known in their days. As to the False Decretals, Mr. Rivington simply echoes faithfully the *mot d'ordre* given out by the Roman authorities ever since the defence of their authenticity has become impossible, which is to make the following assertions: that every privilege and power the False Decretals assign to the Pope had been recognized and acted on long before; that the forgery was not in the Papal interest at all, but in that of Bishops; that it is cruelly false to allege that the Holy See, and specifically Pope Nicholas I., caught at their support; and that there is nothing in the argument that their notorious absence from the Papal archives is evidence of the complicity of the Popes in accrediting the forgery. The third division contests the validity of Mr. Gore's arguments as to the responsibility of the whole Church of England for the renunciation of allegiance to the Pope in Henry VIII.'s reign; and it is in this portion that the mask slips aside for a moment, and the true inspirer of the pamphlet indiscreetly discloses himself to experts. In a few closing paragraphs Mr. Rivington traverses Mr. Gore's citation of St. Bernard's and St. Jerome's language as incompatible with Roman infallibility, treating it as irrelevant, brings up the old charge of Donatism against the Church of England, and contrasts the variety of religious opinion visible within her pale unfavourably with the uniform doctrinal standard of the Church of Rome.

To all this Mr. Gore replies in a pamphlet little more than one-third as long, a detail in itself indicative of the stronger case, since it shows that he is not compelled to multiply words in order to darken counsel. For him, too, we would suggest a motto. 'What mysteries do lie beyond thy dust' might do; but an apter one, with allusion to the spurious erudition of the joint tractate, is Cicero's 'Numquam

eruditum illum pulverem attigistis' (*De Nat. Deorum*, II. xviii. 48). Mr. Gore begins by admitting that one statement on an historical point in his *Roman Catholic Claims* might possibly be found to need correction, or at least modification. It is on the purely subordinate issue of the original source of the petition about Annates, which he had ascribed to Convocation, but which is in fact of uncertain derivation. Then he takes up Mr. Rivington's cavils in their turn; first pointing out that, so far from differing from Dr. Döllinger's view of Hippolytus, it is precisely in accordance therewith that he has used Hippolytus as a convincing testimony against Papal infallibility, the real point being that it is the undisputed eminence and orthodoxy of Hippolytus, his admitted rank as a Saint, which make his language concerning the Pope of his day proof positive that he did not himself account the Pope secure from error, and that his own position was not in the slightest degree affected by his attitude upon this matter. Mr. Gore passes a little too easily over the paragraphs of Mr. Rivington's pamphlet which touch on the False Decretals, confining himself to saying that he did not question that the Papal claims began earlier than the forgery, but that it supplied them with a basis in the early centuries to which they were not entitled. But he had an ample opportunity of impaling Mr. Rivington (or rather his Loyolist prompter) for the ignorance or the bad faith exhibited in this part of *Dust*, by simply citing the letter of Pope Nicolas, defiantly scouting the objection of the Gallican Bishops that they had never heard of these new claims and documents suddenly sprung upon them, and declaring that their absence from any code thitherto brought to public knowledge was no argument at all against them, and that they had long been reverently preserved in the Roman archives.<sup>1</sup> So common a book as

<sup>1</sup> A few sentences of this letter may be advantageously cited in illustration: 'Absit enim, ut cujuscumque usque ad ultimum vitæ suæ diem, qui in Fide Catholica perseveraverit, vel decretalia constituta, vel de ecclesiastica disciplina quælibet exposita, debito cultu et cum summa discretionem non amplectatur opuscula, quæ duntaxat et antiquitus S. Romana ecclesia conservans, vobis quoque custodienda mandavit, et penes se in suis archivis et vetustis rite monumentis recondita veneratur. . . . Quamquam quidam vestrum scripserint, haud illa decretalia priscorum Pontificum in toto codicis Canonum corpore contineri descripta. . . . porro si ideo non esse decretales epistolas priscorum Pontificum Romanorum admittendas dicunt, quia in codice Canonum non habeantur adscriptæ; ergo nec Gregorii sancti, nec ullius alterius qui ante vel post ipsum fuit, est aliquid institutum vel scriptum recipiendum, eo quod in codice Canonum non habeatur adscriptum. . . . nec ipsas divinas Scripturas novi et veteris Testamenti jam recipimus. . . . etiam neutrum horum in codice ecclesiasticorum Canonum habetur insertum. . . . Quoniam si vetus novumque Testamentum recipienda sunt. . . . restat nimirum quod decretales epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum sunt recipiendæ. . . . Itaque nihil interest utrum sint omnia decretalia Sedis Apostolicæ constituta inter canones conciliorum immixta, cum omnia in uno corpore compaginari non possint, et illa eis intersint, quæ firmitatem his quæ desunt et vigorem suum assignent. . . . Consonat autem huic. . . . in decretis suis Papa Gelasius, ita iniquens: "Decretales epistolas quas beatissimi Papæ diversis temporibus ab Urbe Roma pro diversorum Patrum consultatione dederunt,

Janus.  
before  
coarse  
emplo  
and h  
justifi  
is cap  
face a  
incon  
view,  
value  
scious  
needs  
cate r  
thing  
arena  
tiona

The

THE  
conf  
is to  
the t  
appa  
Gree  
ant  
and  
that  
heil-  
Ezel  
vene  
tales  
Pont  
Urb  
temp  
pers  
cillin  
the  
of th  
vero  
san  
trib  
Rom  
Syn  
hab  
ex h  
Ecc  
the  
this

*Janus* might have told Mr. Rivington enough to have made him pause before penning the foolish sentences in which he attempts to deny the coarse complicity of Nicolas in the fraud. Mr. Gore's final pages are employed in vindicating his presentment of Tudor Church history and his citations from St. Bernard and St. Jerome; while he is fully justified in the doubt he expresses at the close whether Mr. Rivington is capable of understanding the nature of an argument or willing to face any definite point with clearness and decision. Mr. Gore has so incontestably the best of the discussion from a scholar's point of view, that we are almost reluctant to even seem to depreciate the value of what he has written by adding what we are not the less conscious of—that he has scarcely allowed sufficiently for the intellectual needs of that large class of readers who are unable to appreciate delicate rapier-play and indirect allusion, and for whom, consequently, things have to be said fully, explicitly, and incisively. The dust of the arena has to be laid, not merely that of the schools, and a proportionally large sprinkler, with very wide orifices, is required for the work.

*The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint.* Vol. I. (Genesis–iv. Kings). Edited by H. B. SWETE, D.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1887.)

THE first instalment of the Cambridge edition of the Septuagint is confessedly a work of merely temporary value. This manual edition is to be followed at some indefinite date by a larger one, in which the text will be based on all the available authorities, while in the *apparatus criticus* it is proposed to give 'the variations of all the Greek uncial MSS., of select Greek cursive MSS., of the more important versions, and of the quotations made by Philo and the earlier and more important ecclesiastical writers.' There can be no doubt that, if Professor Cornill's statement as to the 'Bild einer wahrhaft heil- und trostlosen Verwirrung,' which the Septuagint MSS. of Ezekiel present, may be extended—as with certain limitations it venerabiliter suspiciendas." In quo notandum, quia non dixit: Decretales epistolas quæ inter canones habentur, nec tantum quas moderni Pontifices ediderunt, sed quas beatissimi Papæ diversis temporibus ab Urbe Roma dederunt. Dictis autem diversis temporibus, etiam illa tempora vir sanctus comprehendit, quæ, crebrescentibus Paganorum persecutionibus, ad Sedem Apostolicam deferri causas Episcoporum difficillime permittebant.—Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 869, xii.–xv.

In an earlier letter (862) to the Patriarch Photius Nicolas alleges that the only reason why that Patriarch rejected these Decretals was because of their testimony against the lawfulness of his own consecration: 'Quod vero dicitis, neque Sardicense Concilium, neque Decretalia vos habere sanctorum Pontificum, vel recipere, non facile nobis credendi facultas tribuitur. . . . Decretalia autem quæ a sanctis Pontificibus primæ Sedis Romanæ Ecclesiæ sunt instituta, cujus auctoritate atque sanctione omnes Synodi et sancta Concilia roborantur, et stabilitatem sumunt, cur vos non habere vel observare dicitis, nisi quia vestræ ordinationi contradicunt, et ex laico ad culmen Patriarchatus transvolare resistunt?'—Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 862, xv. See also Dr. Salmon's recent work on *The Infallibility of the Church* (pp. 445–9), which we hope to discuss in a future number of this Review.

may—to the other books of the Old Testament, the accession of so many authorities in the larger edition will largely alter the character of a text based (as in the volume before us) on a few uncial MSS. It is to be hoped that in the process of systematizing the material the proper method of pursuing the inquiry will appear. Are we to rely mainly, as Cornill would suggest, on the evidence of the various derived versions? or shall we attempt, with Lagarde, to restore one by one the three great recensions of Septuagint text to which Jerome makes reference, and then from a comparison of these try to recover the 'Urtext' of the Septuagint? The problem of restoration has many points in common with that of recovering the original 'Vetus Italia,' and in neither is success to be attained by theories which take into consideration only part of the data. Even so careful a worker as Professor Cornill, whose elaborate Prolegomena to his edition of the Book of Ezekiel form so valuable a contribution to the methods of textual criticism in the Old Testament, has had to retract one of his most important generalizations, referred to on page xxiii of the volume under review. He has admitted in the *Nachrichten von der K. G. d. W. zu Göttingen* for May 30, 1888 (pp. 194–6), that B is not based on Origen's work, and has accepted the suggestion made by Dr. Hort in the *Academy* for December 24, 1887.

There is, however, no doubt that the condition of the Septuagint text is better in the earlier than it is in the later books of the Old Testament—better, that is, in the historical than in the prophetic books. And yet even in the better preserved books there are many points which require to be cleared up before the version can be satisfactorily used to establish the Hebrew text. It cannot be said, for example, that the successive labours of Thenius, Wellhausen, and quite recently of Klostermann (in the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*) have finally settled the problems raised by the Septuagint text of the Book of Samuel. Account must be taken of the doublets in the Hexaplar text, as at 4 Kings iv. 34, of corruptions of the Greek in transmission, as at 1 Kings xiv. 40 (where δουλείαν is probably a transcriptional corruption in Greek uncial MSS. of λογείον (= λόγιον) ἔν, and does not point to a different Hebrew text, or even a misreading of the Massoretic text). These are but instances of the truth of the general statement which forms the conclusion of Klostermann's preface: 'Um die LXX für die Beurteilung und Erklärung des Hebräers fruchtbar zu machen, zu der diplomatischen Arbeit die auf allseitige philologische und exegetische Erwägung gestützte Divination hinzukommen muss' (*l.c. Einleitung*, p. xl.). But the edition before us has only to do with what Klostermann points out as the preliminary work. It professes only to render available, in a reliable form, the text of the Septuagint as contained in six of the best uncials. Of these six the first three, which are no doubt also the most important three,  $\aleph$ , A, B, have been for some time accessible in Tischendorf's editions, in the last of which we have a 'nearly full and remarkably accurate collation,' due to Dr. Nestle.  $\aleph$  is, however, very fragmentary for much of this part of the Old Testament, while our knowledge of the various correctors who have

been at  
It may  
at coun  
of the  
xii. 17,  
(p. xxii  
at Gen  
of A n  
from a

The  
through  
careful  
the vol  
Ashbur  
been a  
there is  
rescued  
by Tis  
the na  
illegibl  
MS., s  
Would  
of the  
have b

E (c  
useful  
large l  
it to th  
and als  
of the  
tioned  
(instea  
on p. x  
of the  
limited  
Tische  
we oug  
μεθ' αὐ  
been m  
have th  
E shou

F (c  
text, as  
lacuna  
sugges  
as mig  
iii. pp.  
in whic  
Ceria  
that F

been at work on A and B would seem to be uncertain (pp. xix, xxii). It may here be pointed out that discrepancies exist between the accounts given in Tischendorf and the edition before us as to two of the lacunæ of A, Tischendorf rightly making one begin at 1 Sam. xii. 17, and another end at Psalm lxxix. 12, while Swete's edition (p. xxii) is wrong. Another small difference is found as to the lacuna at Gen. xiv. 14. Swete's edition makes a reference to the readings of A more easy, because they have not, as in Tischendorf, to be got from a combination of text and notes.

The other three uncial MSS., D, E, F, were known mainly through channels inaccessible to the majority of students. It is the careful transcription of these authorities which gives its chief value to the volume before us. D (*Codex Cottonianus Geneseos*) was burnt at Ashburnham House in 1731, and its valuable evidence would have been almost entirely lost but for a MS. collation by Grabe, which there is every reason to believe is extremely accurate. The fragments rescued from the fire (now in the British Museum) have been edited by Tischendorf in the *Monumenta Sacra ined.* vol. ii., but from the nature of the case their evidence is often uncertain and illegible. The D<sup>all</sup>, which meets us so often in the references to the MS., shows the impossibility of any verification of its reading. Would it not have been advantageous to add to the prefatory notice of the MS. a list of the fragments which have survived, as might have been done from Tischendorf's *Prolegomena*, p. xiii?

E (*Codex Bodleianus Geneseos*), like the MS. just noticed, is useful only for the text of Genesis, and even in this there are three large lacunæ. It is a comparatively late MS.—Tischendorf refers it to the eighth century—but is valuable on account of its good text, and also because it contains more than any uncial MS., except two, of the Septuagint version of Genesis. The first of the lacunæ, mentioned on p. xxvi, ought to have been given as xiv. 7 to xviii. 24 (instead of xiv. 6 to xvii. 24); and, in accordance with the promise on p. xvi., there ought to have been a statement in the textual notes of the fact that E at Gen. xx. 14 ends with ἀπε . . . of ἀπέδωκεν. A limited comparison of this MS. with its readings as given in Tischendorf, *Monumenta Sacra*, vol. ii., suggests that in Gen. xxxi. 23 we ought to have had E agreeing with A for μεθ' ἐαυτοῦ, as against the μεθ' αὐτοῦ of F. In Gen. xlii. 9 (App.) the reading ἐστὲ should have been marked E<sup>17</sup>at, as ἐρη is marked in xxxi. 38, because both these have the same sign in Tischendorf (*l.c. Proleg.* p. xl). In Gen. xlii. 15 E should have been added to the authorities for μὲ as against ῥῥ.

F (*Codex Ambrosianus*) contains much more of the Septuagint text, as it goes down to Joshua xii. 12. There are, however, large lacunæ, and therefore it would be useful, as has been already suggested with regard to D, to have such a list of the extant portions as might be provided from Ceriani's *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, iii. pp. ix-x. In regard to this MS. certain points may be noticed, in which the readings of the Cambridge edition do not agree with Ceriani's transcript. Thus, in Joshua x. 37, the mark which signifies that F's evidence is available after a lacuna should be inserted before



ἦν ἐν αὐτῇ, and not in its present place. In Deut. xxviii. 63 it should have been marked as ending with ἡν φραν . . . instead of the F<sup>vid</sup> of the textual note, and the last note on p. 118 might have been omitted. Again, in Gen. xxxi. 23, 24, 27 F should be marked as mutilated: in Gen. xxxi. 22 its reading ἱακω is not noticed, nor is the reading ἀκριβῆ in Deut. i. 14; nor in Exod. xxxi. 18 is it quoted, as it might have been, for Σινά. The notation used in Deut. i. 7 does not imply clearly that F repeats ποταμοῦ twice—ἔως τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου.

It will thus be seen that even a limited comparison of the Cambridge edition with the authorities on which it professes to be based shows that there are a certain number of corrections to be made. Those quoted may seem trifling, but it must be remembered that accuracy is the sole justification for the existence of what must be, in the nature of things, an ephemeral text. Complete accuracy was hardly to be expected where the possibilities of error were so numerous, and the text before us has attained it so nearly that we cannot but feel that it will prove a useful and reliable edition. It seems to be almost, if not quite, free from misprints, and the fact of its being issued from the Cambridge University Press is a sufficient guarantee of the clearness and excellence of the Greek type.

*Church History.* By Professor KURTZ, translated by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A. Vol. I. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.)

THE well-known *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* of Professor J. H. Kurtz has stood the tests of age and use in a quite extraordinary degree. It is now nearly half a century old; a new edition of it has been demanded about once in every five years: it has already twice appeared in an English form, at Edinburgh in 1860 and at Philadelphia in 1870. Mr. Macpherson has used its ninth edition; a tenth edition was published three years ago. Its standpoint is that of orthodox Lutheranism, symbolizing at not a few points much more closely with Catholicism than with Calvinism or Puritanism—a characteristic which led its first English translator to take many unjustifiable liberties with its text. In method and clearness of statement it is almost unrivalled amongst German works of this class. Its new translator has done his best, according to his lights, to preserve these two good qualities, although he has here and there somewhat mangled the method and dimmed the clearness of the original.

Professor Kurtz states in his preface that in his division of Church history into periods he has set aside the customary separation of the 'Apostolic' age from the 'post-Apostolic' and the 'Old Catholic' ages. Such an arbitrary separation seems to him, he says, to be unhistorical and incompatible with the facts. He can trace no hard break between the age of the Apostles and the age of Irenæus, when the great Church in its entirety was everywhere recognized as 'the Catholic' Church. The 'Old Catholic' age in Kurtz's arrangement is succeeded by the 'Ecumenical-Catholic Imperial' age, which began with the conversion of Constantine, and was the period of the Councils

acknow  
the Ea  
about  
Church  
Cathol  
West a  
markin  
appear  
'the A  
Kurtz'  
zutrag  
(Ecum  
Kurtz,  
speaks  
was 'in  
of 'Na  
Germa  
Russia  
not be  
Philist  
ties 'J  
'Churc  
either  
disloca  
in the  
and en  
Church  
held to  
power  
by the  
possess  
gether  
Empire  
that 'C  
differ  
his tran  
'the p  
(Ecum  
says 'C  
added  
ground  
In  
Old C  
strifes  
formati  
system  
is resp  
already  
astical  
'eccles  
VOI

acknowledged œcumenically, or by the whole Christian community in the East and the West. The division between East and West brought about an entirely different period, when 'the Œcumenical Catholic Church' was definitively sundered into two bodies, 'the Roman Catholic' and 'the Greek Catholic.' Kurtz regards Cyprian in the West and Origen in the East as the two most characteristic and epoch-marking persons of the 'Old Catholic' period. The translator appears not to approve of Dr. Kurtz's division; for he has set up 'the Apostolic age' as an independent epoch, and has expunged Dr. Kurtz's protest that such a 'Verselbständigung' is 'mehrfach unzutraglich.' The translator confusedly talks of 'the age of the Œcumenical Catholic or Byzantine-Roman National Church.' Dr. Kurtz, we need hardly say, never made so queer a blunder. He speaks indeed of a 'Reichskirche,' but he means a Church which was 'imperial,' and therefore was not 'national.' The development of 'National' Churches within the Catholic Church—the Gallican, German, Spanish, English, and other Churches in the West, or the Russian, Bulgarian, Servian, and other Churches in the East—could not begin until a later age. The translator may possibly hold the Philistine doctrine of the Liberation Society, that wherever the qualities 'Imperial,' 'National,' or 'State' are prefixed to the word 'Church' they must mean one and the same thing. Hence he has either grievously misunderstood his author, or else has purposely dislocated the order and changed the nomenclature which he found in the original. During the period which began with the Apostles and ended with the recognition of the Church by the Empire, the Church as a phenomenon in history is seen by Kurtz to have been held together as one by the sheer force of its own inward spiritual power and its own organization. After the recognition of the Church by the Empire, the Church, as a phenomenon in history—while still possessing all that it previously had—is seen to be outwardly held together as one (1) by its relation to the supposed Œcumenical Roman Empire, and (2) by its Œcumenical Councils. When Dr. Kurtz says that 'the three ages Apostolic, post-Apostolic, and Old Catholic' differ from 'the following Œcumenical-Catholic Imperial Church,' his translator arbitrarily cuts out the 'Apostolic' age, and says that 'the post-Apostolic' and 'Old Catholic' ages differed from 'the Œcumenical-Catholic National Church.' As wherever Dr. Kurtz says 'three' the translator coolly substitutes 'two,' he ought to have added some note to prove that Dr. Kurtz is in the wrong and on what grounds he corrects him.

In Dr. Kurtz's section on the 'Doctrinal Controversies of the Old Catholic Age' we are told that 'frictions (*Reibungen*) and strifes were not wanting within the Church' as preliminaries to 'the formation and settlement of the contents of the Church's doctrinal system.' We hope that it is the printer, and not the translator, who is responsible for the statement that '*fiction* and controversy had already begun as a preparation for the construction of the ecclesiastical system of doctrine.' Mr. Macpherson uses the one word 'ecclesiastical' as a synonym for very different German words and

expressions. He properly enough renders 'kirchlich' (churchly) as 'ecclesiastical.' But when Dr. Kurtz distinguishes the offices in the Church as 'Gemeindeämter' and 'Geistesämter'—that is, 'congregational offices' and 'spiritual offices'—he translates the former as 'ecclesiastical' and the latter as 'ministerial.' Thus he makes out the bishop and the deacon to be merely 'ecclesiastical,' whereas the apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, and teacher were all 'ministerial.' We fail to discover the object of this queer translation, unless it be the exaltation of 'the minister' in the sense of modern Puritan and Methodist clericalism. In one place, where the theories of author and translator do not seem to square conveniently, the latter oddly renders 'Geistesämter' as 'a divine call.' The range of the German term 'Gemeinde' has evidently been a trouble to Mr. Macpherson. Dr. Kurtz invariably means by it 'a congregation,' which Mr. Macpherson always translates 'Church,' although he is obliged to use the same English word as the translation of 'Kirche.' He translates 'klericalen Gemeindeämter' as 'regular ecclesiastical offices.' He misrepresents by his omissions what Dr. Kurtz says about baptism. 'Infant baptism,' declares the translator, 'though not universally admitted, was yet in theory almost universally admitted to be proper. Tertullian alone is found opposing it.' But what Dr. Kurtz says is that 'although the baptism of children cannot be proved by any particular instance to have been the practice of the Apostles, it is certainly conceivable from Acts ii. 39, xvi. 33, 1 Cor. vii. 14 that it was so. Later, if it was not even universally introduced, it was in theory almost universally acknowledged as allowable. Tertullian alone is an opponent of it, whilst Origen regards it as apostolical tradition.' Is Mr. Macpherson amongst the anti-Origenists? He excludes his author's reference to Origen.

Mr. Macpherson's feats as a translator become exceedingly quaint when he gets into the period described by the author as 'das germanisch-romanische Mittelalter,' and paraphrased by the translator as 'the German and Roman Church during the Middle Ages.' Dr. Kurtz speaks of the numerous English pilgrimages 'to the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles' ('des Apostelfürsten,' in the singular, meaning St. Peter'), which Mr. Macpherson renders in the plural as 'the chief Apostles.' 'For the fostering of these pilgrimages' ('dieser Pilger'—these pilgrims—is what Dr. Kurtz says) 'and as a training school for English clergy,' Mr. Macpherson continues, 'the *Schola Saxonica* was founded in the eighth century, and for its maintenance and that of the States of the Church, on St. Peter's Day, June 29, was collected the so-called Peter's pence.' He is clearly of the notion that by 'der h. Stätten' ('the holy places' in Rome visited by the pilgrims) Dr. Kurtz means 'der Kirchenstaat,' the Papal territory. If the translator had taken the trouble to make some independent study of his subject he would have saved himself from not a few astounding blunders. Sometimes the translation is made to say the exact opposite of the original. 'Soon after the election' (of Pope Gregory IV. in 827), says the translator, 'political troubles arose in the Frankish kingdom, which contributed to the

ema  
the  
geot  
a wo  
mak  
natio  
obje  
the l  
with  
auth  
Reic  
Dr.  
emp  
Reic  
the l  
him  
Dr.  
mean  
peron  
phers  
the o  
Fr.' r  
in a  
if he  
enthu  
in Fr  
accor  
not '  
Parte  
T  
been  
uses t  
Bonif  
that V  
Latin  
He te  
and c  
He n  
'Eine  
the G  
tion a  
imagin  
Dr. K  
canon  
the n  
book  
to hav  
'book  
suppo  
'Nica

emancipation of the nation from the Papacy.' Dr. Kurtz says that the political confusions which broke out could not but be advantageous to the longings of the *Papacy* for emancipation.' There is not a word about 'the nation' in the original. Gregory IV. hoped to make himself independent of the empire and to bring the young national Churches into subjection to his see, but he failed in both objects. Mr Macpherson tells us that 'the *Pope* gathered to a diet the bishops who remained true to the old emperor, threatened them with excommunication. But they answered the Pope that he had no authority in France.' As if the Pope could have summoned the Reichstag! It was held at Worms, and not 'in France.' What Dr. Kurtz says is that the Pope threatened the bishops whom the emperor, as head of the 'Reich,' or empire, had assembled at a Reichstag in Worms. Nor does Dr. Kurtz say that the bishops told the Pope that he had no authority 'in France,' but that they told him that he could not give commands in 'the empire of the Franks.' Dr. Kurtz uses the definite article, '*im* Frankenreich;' if he had meant 'in France' he would have said '*in* Frankreich.' The emperor was 'Ludwig der Fromme' (Lewis the Pious), whom Mr. Macpherson oddly calls again and again 'Louis of France.' Finding in the original 'Ludwig d. Fr.,' he jumped to the conclusion that 'd. Fr.' must stand for 'des Frankreichs.' This initial confusion leads in a heap of other confusions, so that Mr. Macpherson, just as if he had been taught mediæval geography by a modern French enthusiast for the war of the *revanche*, locates many a German city in France. Charles the Great and his sons are all 'French kings,' according to him, although Dr. Kurtz calls them 'Fränk. Könige,' not 'Französische Könige;' so where the translator finds 'Fränk. Partei' he renders it as 'French party.'

The contractions which occur so frequently in the original have been a puzzle and a snare to the translator. Wherever Dr. Kurtz uses the contraction 'h.' for 'heilige,' such as 'der h. Boniface' ('St. Boniface'), Mr. Macpherson always obliterates the prefix. He states that Walafrid Strabo's *Glossæ ordinariæ* are 'short explanations of the Latin part of the Bible,' his equivalent for 'zum lat. Texte der Bibel.' He tells us that 'the rulers of the West Franks combined their forces, and called an Imperial synod at Savonnières, a frontier city of Toul.' He might as reasonably call Islington 'a frontier city of London.' 'Eine Vorstadt' means a suburb. The *Regula pastoralis* of Gregory the Great, according to Mr. Macpherson, 'obtained in the West a position almost equal to the canonical books.' The ignorant reader will imagine that it was placed nearly on a level with the Bible. But Dr. Kurtz merely says 'zu fast kanonischem Ansehen' ('to almost canonical authority'). A series of German and Gallican councils in the ninth century promulgated 'canons,' urging the study of the book upon all bishops and pastors. In the Gallican Church it seems to have been given to a bishop at his consecration along with the 'book of the canons' of the Church. By 'das Nicänum' Dr. Kurtz supposes the reader will understand 'symbol,' or creed, and not 'Niceanism,' as his translator puts it. He has hacked about at will

the author's sections upon the Christian festivals. 'The first traces of the Christmas festival in the Roman Church,' says he, 'are found about A.D. 360; some decades later they appear in the Eastern Church.' Dr. Kurtz says, 'The first express mention of the Christmas festival, as customary in the Roman Church about 360, is to be found in Ambrose; but its first introduction must have taken place some decades earlier.' 'The Christmas festival,' says Kurtz, 'corresponded to a universally felt Christian need, and hence it spread out from Rome with surprising rapidity, not merely over the whole West, but even over the whole East, so that Chrysostom could already extol it as the *ἐορτὴ πᾶσων σεμνοτάτῃ* and the *μητρόπολις πᾶσων τῶν ἐορτῶν*.' For this sentence of the original the translator has provided the following substitute: 'The late introduction of this festival is to be explained from the disregard of the birthday and the prominence given to the day of the death of Christ in the ancient Church; but Chrysostom even regarded it as the *μητρόπολις πᾶσων τῶν ἐορτῶν*.' Dr. Kurtz, speaking of the Missa Fidelium during the first three centuries, says that the Communion of the faithful was not preceded by any formal act of confession. 'The need of such an act was not as yet felt,' he adds, 'because its place was supplied by the existing disciplinary and liturgical regulations.' His translator perverts the author's statement by saying, 'The need of such an act as a regular disciplinary and liturgical ordinance had not as yet made itself felt.'

In short, we have never come upon a translation which stood in greater need of a revision. 'Spiritualismus' is rendered by Mr. Macpherson as 'religious idealism,' 'künstliche Relief-Arbeiten' as 'practice in relieve work,' Charles the Great's 'schöpferisch-reformatorischen Wirken' as 'Charlemagne's powerful' (instead of 'creative') 'efforts in the direction of reform.' When Kurtz states that Agobard opposed the mechanical theory of inspiration by the assertion that the holy prophets were 'something better' ('mehr gewesen') than Balaam's she ass, Mr. Macpherson actually makes him say that they 'were more foolish than Balaam's ass.' He translates 'Erzbisthum' (archbishopric) as 'archbishop.' He interprets 'Reichsstand'—where the original refers to the metropolitan sees—as 'a party in the empire.' The Liberation Society no doubt considers the English bench of bishops to be 'a party' in the nation. But 'Stand' is the technical name in the Teutonic lands, as Germany and the older Swiss cantons, for a political 'estate.' The best English translation of 'Reichsstand' would be 'estate of the realm.' Hincmar, says Dr. Kurtz, twice defeated the Pope, 'a second time in his own affair,' or 'concern.' Mr. Macpherson translates 'in eigener Sache' as 'in a document of his own.' When Dr. Kurtz says that the so-called Hatch theory of the origin of the episcopate was first expounded by Heinrich, and was grounded by him upon 'bezügliche Schriften' of Mommsen and Foucart, Mr. Macpherson not only renders the above words as 'original researches,' but obliterates all mention of Heinrich, and thus denies his claim to priority of invention. He makes Dr. Kurtz father the theory upon Mr. Hatch. He has no right to rob one scholar to pay another, and misrepresent a third scholar as the real

ba  
for h  
occu  
The

THE  
The  
com  
in fi  
no t  
alth  
expl  
origi  
tion.  
be c  
uses,  
copie  
and,  
logic

I  
'thin  
of p  
pole  
very  
corre  
excus  
Rom  
only  
Rom  
great  
tend  
to d  
medi  
524,

It  
ignor  
p. 50  
byter  
bapti

'T  
Chur  
with  
the b  
times,  
bapti  
appro  
usage  
We sh  
Roma

bandit. He seems to have a particular tenderness towards Mr. Hatch, for he forces references to his works into places where they do not occur in the original.

*The Catacombs of Rome and their Testimony relative to Primitive Christianity.* By the Rev. W. H. WITHROW, M.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.)

THE want which Mr. Withrow attempts to supply is a real one. There is no thoroughly good popular book in English on the Catacombs; and we should be glad if we could say that he had succeeded in filling the gap. For the author and his publishers have spared no trouble; the book is copiously illustrated with woodcuts, which, although somewhat rough, serve to give a very fair idea of what is explained in the text; and Mr. Withrow, although not writing as an original authority, has always gone to the best sources for information. He is free from the various antiquated errors which used to be common, and gives a very valuable account of the history, the uses, and the explorations of the Catacombs. He quotes inscriptions copiously, he illustrates them by constant extracts from the Fathers, and, with a little more self-restraint and a little more thorough theological knowledge, he might have produced a really useful book.

He tells us in the preface that he writes as a Protestant, and 'thinks no apology is necessary for the somewhat polemical character of portions of the book.' Now if he had been only moderately polemical we should not have complained; the Catacombs have been very unfairly used by some Roman Catholic controversialists, and a correction of their errors might be almost necessary, and certainly excusable. But the long pages of extravagant tirade against modern Romanism, which have nothing to do directly with the subject, not only spoil the book, but miss their object. Extravagant abuse of Rome will always produce a reaction towards Rome, and is also a great stumbling-block to many half-Christians. If one part of Christendom says that the other is so very degraded, many a man begins to doubt the truth of Christianity altogether. The account of mediæval and modern Mariolatry, p. 319 *sq.*, the notes on pp. 521, 524, the peroration, p. 551, are instances.

It is partly owing to this Protestantism and partly to theological ignorance that we find some very curious theological statements. On p. 507 he gives a list of the Greek hierarchy which includes 'presbyter, proto-deacon, deacon, sub-deacon, and common priest.' On baptism he is very confused:—

'The Church of the Catacombs . . . did not, after the manner of the Church of Rome and other modern extreme sacramentalists, invest it with *regenerative* power, nor regard its involuntary omission as excluding the body from consecrated ground and the soul from heaven. Sometimes, by a beautiful metonymy derived from its spiritual significance, baptism is indicated as the *palingenesis*, or new birth, of which it is the appropriate symbol. The following is a characteristic example of this usage: CÆLESTE RENATUS AQUA' (pp. 534, 535).

We should be glad to know what extreme sacramentalists or modern Romans look upon the 'involuntary omission' of baptism as excluding



the soul from heaven, and also why we may believe in '*palingenesis*' and not '*regeneration*.' Again, to write 'the blasphemous title Theotokos, Mother of God,' shows ignorance of what the title implies. Much of the strength of Rome lies in such ill-considered attacks on the Church of the past.

As might be expected, Mr. Withrow's treatment of the subject of prayers for the dead is one of the least satisfactory parts of his book. It is well known that from the earliest times, as is proved by the Fathers, by liturgies, and by inscriptions, this custom prevailed; and on p. 442 are collected (quite honestly) examples of it, the early date of which is shown by their Greek language or character. They are explained in the following way:—

'And, be it remembered, these inscriptions were not a formulated and authoritative creed framed by learned theologians, but the untutored utterances of humble peasants, many of whom were recent converts from paganism or Judaism, in which religions such expressions were a customary sepulchral formula' (p. 443).

This may be true, but the whole of Mr. Withrow's book is an appeal to the purity of the Primitive Church, and on p. 415 he quotes an extract from Dean Stanley which asserts that the special value of the Catacombs is that they give the real feelings of the people better than they can be learnt from an elaborate theological treatise. If primitive Christianity was pure we must accept its teaching, and not explain it away just when we happen to disagree with it.

We have said nothing so far about the style. Mr. Withrow has a considerable command of language, but he overloads his book with rhetorical ornament. There is no doubt some difficulty in restraining oneself when one has such an excellent subject for rhetoric as the Catacombs, but we get tired of such passages as the following: 'We may read the irrefragable testimony, written with a pen of iron in the rock for ever, of the purity of the primitive faith, and of the gradual corruption which it has undergone.' If Mr. Withrow in his next edition strikes out every passage he thinks particularly fine, and learns to be historical instead of Protestant, he may produce a very useful work.

*History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion from the Reformation to Kant.* By BERNHARD PÜNJER. Translated from the German by W. HASTIE, B.D., with a Preface by ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1887.)

In his preface to this work Dr. Flint says of one section, 'With laborious conscientiousness our author has striven to give a complete account. Will the ordinary reader find the account even intelligible?' For not being intelligible in the instance quoted—in describing that somewhat doubtful claimant to philosophic distinction, Jacob Böhme—we may pardon him, but 'laborious conscientiousness' is certainly the distinguishing feature throughout.

The book has very decided merits. It has full Teutonic completeness; it has a preface in which the 'History of the Philosophy of Religion is defined and justified,' with an ample use of philosophic

phra  
relig  
scio  
Phil  
of ir  
only

with  
muc  
clea  
olog  
stan

we c  
deal  
alwa

phil  
out  
to b  
from  
the  
and

A M

'BE  
begr  
criti  
and  
arriv

In t  
to h  
desc

scie  
the f  
calls  
the  
whic  
of I  
worl  
thou  
tran

and  
form  
whic

phraseology. The question is asked, 'Whether the philosophy of religion should merely give a phenomenology of the religious consciousness?' And after the preface a review is given of Religious Philosophy down to the Reformation in order to take away the charge of incompleteness which might be made against a work which began only in the fifteenth century.

It has, too, the merit of objectivity, *i.e.* all the systems are analyzed with an honesty and care worthy of a *précis* writer, and with about as much regard to their external relations. It has, too, this amount of clearness, that anyone who is acquainted with the philosophic phraseology of all the writers passed under review will be able to understand their philosophy—and not otherwise.

As an honest, laborious piece of work and as a book of reference we can give Dr. Pünjer's *History* unqualified praise. Where it has dealt with periods with which we have any acquaintance we have always found it fair, correct, and discriminating.

But there is something more demanded from an historian of philosophy than a correct analysis of a succession of systems. Without being subjective, and reading into them his own views, he ought to be able to make them clear and intelligible to those who come from outside to study them, and he ought to show the connexion of the speculations with the thought of the age. This is a harder task, and one which Dr. Pünjer has hardly attempted.

*A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament.* By Dr. BERNHARD WEISS, Ober-Konsistorialrath and Professor of Theology. Translated from the German by A. J. K. DAVIDSON. In two volumes. Vol. I. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887.)

'BERNHARD WEISS, who first appeared in print with his *Petrin. Lehrbegriff* (Berlin, 1855), and then directed his attention chiefly to the criticism of the Gospels, in the course of his minute, exegetical, critical, and biblico-theological works respecting modern criticism as a whole, arrived mainly at conservative results' (p. 23).

In this somewhat curious manner Dr. Weiss, in the Introduction to his *Introduction to the New Testament*, describes, and correctly describes, his own work.

It is needless to remark that, being a German, his book is as scientifically complete as it can be made; that he has a full account of the founding, of the history, the problem, and the method of what he calls the 'Science of Introduction'; and that his book shows none of the independence and imperfection of arrangement and literary power which, in the eyes of Germans, is supposed to detract from the merits of Dr. Salmon's *Introduction*. It is, however, an extremely valuable work, which gives at once the idea of honesty and originality of thought, and we are very gratified to those to whom we owe the translation from the language in which it was written.

The present volume contains the history of the Canon as a whole and of the Pauline Epistles, and both are admirably done. Of the former he says, 'It is the official recognition of the collective Church which makes a writing universally known,' and 'the reception of in-

dividual books into this Canon was in itself no guarantee of their Apostolic origin, since very diverse motives contributed to its origin' (p. 147). We owe our Canon to the formative influence of the Church, and this implies, he thinks, the inherent merit of the work, but not necessarily an Apostolic origin.

In the discussion of the Pauline Epistles the only points where we think he does not take the best view are those on which he has not had the advantage of being acquainted with the results of English criticism. He apologizes in the preface for not having had time to keep up with foreign theological literature, and he certainly might have learnt a good deal from Bishop Lightfoot's discussion of the date of the Philippians' and of the Colossian heresy. He sums up the case for and against the Pastoral Epistles without over-stating the conservative view, and thus bringing out more fully the weakness of the positive arguments against their genuineness.

The not very lucid style of the original is not always made more clear in the translation, and occasionally we have noted passages which fail to represent the original. The printing is not good. Whom are we to hold responsible for such an enormity, in a book which professes to be learned, as a page filled with Greek words of which *ἀρεσκείν* (*sic*) is the only one that boasts an accent?

*The Ancient World and Christianity.* By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D.  
Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD HOLMDEW. (London :  
Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.)

The object of Dr. Pressensé's latest work is best described in his own words :

'In preparing the present work we have traced with profound satisfaction the indications of this Divine law through all the religions of antiquity as these have come down to us in their sacred books. Everywhere and always we have found the voice of conscience uplifted in support of the law of right, even when this had become gravely obscured in the national worship' (p. viii).

Starting with prehistoric man, he traces the evolution of religion upwards. He describes the Chaldeo-Assyrian religion, the religions of Egypt and Phœnicia. He then passes on to the primitive Aryans and Zoroaster; to the religions of India, the Vedas, Brahmanism, and Buddha; then to Hellenic Paganism, and finally to the Græco-Roman world at the coming of Christ.

The book must of course labour under one defect, from which the same author's work on the history of Christianity was free—he cannot write as an original authority, or give the results of original research, about all these different systems; but he does what is next best—he in all cases consults the best authors who have treated each special subject, and more than this no one who wishes to form a philosophical conception of so many systems can do. No one, for example, will accuse Herbert Spencer of any acquaintance with original authorities in his work on ecclesiastical institutions, or with any idea of doing more than selecting the theory which harmonizes best with his philosophy.

fection  
truth  
human  
he de  
the f  
with a  
becau  
not s  
certai  
adequ  
draw  
Persi  
must  
Tiber  
level.

T  
prese  
of res  
thetic  
tiani

An

We  
draw  
are g  
show  
main  
Chri  
and  
tions

St. J

Mr.  
was  
on th  
cong

by th  
both  
this,  
genu  
part  
Mr.  
of e  
Farr

The scope of the book is to point out, on the one hand, the imperfections of all the religions described; on the other, the glimpses of truth which they contain, and the manner in which they prepared the human mind to perceive the need of the 'Word of God.' At the end, he describes the religious chaos and moral decline which accompanied the formation of the Roman Empire; and here, although writing with a complete knowledge of the materials, he is somewhat deficient, because he writes too much as a rhetorician and apologist, and does not see the other side. Anyone who knows the literature and certain developments of the Parisian life of the day, and how inadequately they represent even France, ought to hesitate before he draws his pictures from the exaggerations of satirists like Juvenal or Persius. In order to compare Christian and heathen morality we must not compare a country vicarage with the imperial court of Tiberius or Nero. Life in the provinces was probably on a higher level.

The pleasant style in which the book is written, and which is preserved in the translation, will enable it to appeal to a large class of readers to whom an account of heathen religions which is sympathetic and rational, without sacrificing the exclusive claims of Christianity, will be of great service.

*An Explanation of the Gospel according to St. John.* By the Rev. W. H. B. PROBY, M.A. (London: J. T. Hayes, 1888.)

WE had occasion in reviewing a previous work by Mr. Proby to draw attention to some erroneous statements that he had made; we are glad that we have little to say against this book. It does not show any great mental power, but for the purpose for which it is mainly intended—for the use of district visitors, reading to professed Christians—it may be found useful. The interpretation of the third and sixth chapters seems to us good and adequate, and the explanations of difficult passages are simple, and easy to follow.

*St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel.* By HOWARD HEBER EVANS, B.A., late Vicar of Mapperley, and formerly Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1888.)

MR. EVANS has previously written a book to prove that St. Paul was the author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel; on this occasion he has chosen a more hopeful theme, but we cannot congratulate him on the manner in which he has executed it.

His method is to prove that the Apocalypse and the Gospel are by the same author, and then to show that the external evidence for both is that they are by St. John. There is a certain boldness about this, as the great difficulty many critics have found in proving the genuineness of St. John's Gospel is the difference, partly in style, partly in thought, between it and the Apocalypse. These differences Mr. Evans wholly ignores. He has made his book almost entirely out of extracts from other books; he quotes, for example, Archdeacon Farrar, who says that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was a mystic,

and Professor Reuss, who says the author of the Apocalypse was a mystic, and follows a similar method under many headings. The cumulative argument has, of course, considerable weight, but it is weakened when we find such headings as 'A Thoroughly Earnest Christian.' Is there really anything peculiar in a book of the New Testament being written by a 'thoroughly earnest Christian'? Again, it is undoubted that there are resemblances in phraseology between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, but in the list given in the Appendix (pp. 119-130) a large number of phrases are included on which absolutely no stress can be laid at all. What use is there in informing us that  $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  or  $\text{ἰδοὺ}$  (which occurs very seldom in St. John's Gospel) are found in both writings, or that  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \text{ἰγ\`ν\`ε\`ρ\`ο}$  occurs in one, and  $\text{ἦλθεν ὁ γ\`α\`μ\`ο\`ς}$  in the other. The greater part of this long list is absolutely valueless.

We have criticized Mr. Evans severely, not because we for a moment hesitate to believe that the two books are the work of the same author, but because his method of criticism, which ignores all difficulties and is quite unable to appreciate the merits of argument, will not help to solve the problem. The fact that he omits all accents when he writes Greek will not please scholars.

*The Mental Characteristics of the Lord Jesus Christ.* By the Rev. HENRY NORRIS BERNARD, M.A., LL.B. (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1888.)

MR. BERNARD has undertaken a task which it is extremely difficult to carry out without irreverence, and which, we must confess, we wish he had not attempted. That lessons from the life of Christ may be drawn for our example is obvious, that the motives which are ascribed to Him in the Gospels may be analyzed is true, and it may be difficult sometimes to say what are the limits of legitimate speculation; but we must own we feel that we are trespassing on very dangerous ground when we dare to analyze the character of Jesus, when we ascribe motives, when we talk of His 'tact' or 'self-possession,' when we attempt to discriminate between the human and divine elements, the masculine and the feminine qualities of His mind.

In many ways Mr. Bernard has done his task well; he does not dwell upon the human element in order to obscure the divine; he recognizes both elements; there is, we believe, no intentional irreverence. There are also passages of considerable beauty, though tending to become sentimental. In dealing, however, with the character of the Blessed Virgin and her relations to Christ, he makes an attack upon her which is as unwarranted as it is indefensible, and will give a shock to all reverent minds. We do not know whether this has arisen from ultra-Protestantism; if so, we must remind Mr. Bernard that the excessive devotion of one section of the Church does not justify what is almost a blasphemous attack in another section. We refer chiefly to the whole of the chapter on 'The Home Life of Christ,' but perhaps an extract from the account of His crucifixion will best illustrate what we have said:

'M  
She h  
estran  
suffer  
childr  
(p. 26)

T  
E.g.  
symp  
chara  
false  
do no  
his fa  
religi  
Lidd  
of ju  
or of  
And  
dang

The  
LE

MR.  
he sh

'  
the p  
finds  
limit  
has  
fanc  
idea  
sam  
(p. 1

He  
view  
by a  
titi  
ana  
equ  
infl  
sen  
who  
cha  
We  
era  
a fa

of t  
fou

'Mary had not been all that a mother might have been to such a Son. She had not understood: and not understanding, she had let a certain estrangement grow up between her and the Lord Jesus Christ. She had suffered herself to be influenced by the unworthy suggestions of her other children, whose jealousy and dislike of their elder brother was no secret' (p. 267).

There are other passages which have a very unpleasant sound. *E.g.* 'The Lord Jesus Christ was no cynic, and in Him the need of sympathy was strong.' Further, the allusions to the continuity of character before and after the Resurrection do not so much strike a false note as show that the whole investigation is out of place. We do not wish to be severe upon Mr. Bernard, because we believe that his faults arise from errors of judgment rather than from want of religious feeling. But we ask him to read the chapter in Canon Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, in which he dwells upon the impossibility of judging the character of Christ from a purely human standpoint, or of separating the human and divine. 'Si non Deus, non bonus.' And if this be true, an analysis of His character must always be a dangerous task to attempt.

*The Religious Sentiments of the Human Mind.* By DANIEL GREEN-LEAF THOMPSON. (London and New York: Longmans, 1888.)

MR. THOMPSON divides his investigation into four parts. In the first he shows the origin of religious sentiments:

'Given a self-distinguishing and self-active consciousness, which in the process of its self-distinguishing and in the exercise of its self-activity, finds a limitation of its knowledge and power, which by virtue of that limitation is compelled to posit a something beyond the limit, and which has in constant employment a constructive faculty, enabling it to develop fancies, imaginations, ideals, and hypotheses—given thus much, and the idea of a supernatural or an extra-natural, with some notions about the same, must inevitably arise. Hence the genesis of religious sentiments' (p. 17).

He then examines these sentiments from an intellectual point of view, and discovers that we can only learn about the world beyond by analogy with this life, that all our hypotheses are 'symbolical fictitious constructions of a supernatural world according to various analogies of the natural world' (p. 80). All religions being therefore equally true or equally false, we must next consider what are the moral influences of different forms. We now begin to discover his own sentiments: 'In a former work I have undertaken to show that this whole notion of sin in its effects upon the individual and social character is highly deleterious, and ought to be eradicated' (p. 103). We quite agree with him that sin ought to be eradicated, but to eradicate the notion of sin is impossible while sin remains, for sin is a fact primarily, not a doctrine. Of Christianity he writes:—

'Christian theologians have persevered and relied upon the hebetude of their disciples to proclaim and maintain a doctrine that these three or four divine persons are one God, and that their system is hence mono-



theistic. Men are unhappily quite ready to allow their intelligence to be insulted, even to the extent of persuading themselves to believe, because they think they ought in a spirit of reverence for authority, that black is white, and that two and two make five' (p. 112).

Such language is absolutely indefensible in a writer who professes to be a philosopher. Were he an uneducated man who had only been taught something about Christianity from outside, it would be painful to read, but might be excusable on his part. As it is, Mr. Thompson has written a book on psychology; he has picked up all the common philosophic jargon about the limits of the human intellect, yet he first accuses the greatest Christian intellects of hebetude or dishonesty, and then proceeds to criticize Christian doctrines without understanding them, and as if there was no limit to the power of the human intellect. 'This theological arithmetic is of course meaningless'—*i.e.* it is not in accordance with our ordinary experience. But he has already shown that the limits of the human mind are clearly defined. What right has he then, on *a priori* grounds, to condemn as nonsense a doctrine about that which is beyond the limits of the human intellect? He shows that he does not understand the philosophy he quotes so glibly.

He makes many other attacks on Christianity as offensive as that we have quoted, which we have not space to criticize. We must pass on to his views on religious liberty. From the dedication of the book we gather that this is a point on which he feels strongly, but his idea of it is curious. In the first place he would absolutely exclude clergymen from holding any position as trustee or on a board of government for schools. Why? Because they have 'a retainer,' because 'their opinions have no value as regards truth.' 'To give them any longer the controlling power, either in a faculty or among trustees . . . is to interpose the most effectual means to arrest progress in higher education,' &c. (see p. 173).

Now Mr. Thompson has made up his mind that the Christian religion is nonsense; a clergyman has made up his mind that it is true. Why is the clergyman disqualified, and not Mr. Thompson? The clergyman has a retainer. So has Mr. Thompson. The clergyman is in favour of one system of religious instruction, Mr. Thompson of another. If Mr. Thompson condemns the clergyman for excluding agnostics, by reason of being agnostics, from the board of a school, what right has an agnostic to exclude a clergyman because he is a clergyman? Mr. Thompson talks about the return of the fagot. He does not see that it is he that is bringing it back, that in the name of religious liberty he is damaging its first principles, and refusing liberty to all who have a definite belief, in the cause of what he calls scientific teaching.

His system of education is similar; it consists of the establishment and endowment of agnosticism; apparently religious education is to be compulsory, and every child has to be taught the arguments for and against all religions. What the moral effect of this teaching would be we leave to the imagination. What we wish to notice is that it is as much an interference with religious liberty to

compo  
compo  
M  
princi  
liberty  
believ  
impos

Faith

THE  
an u  
autho  
betwe  
Chur  
strate  
ganis  
truth  
are v  
super  
appli  
demo  
apt i  
influ  
unde  
dear  
Faith  
spire  
that  
whom  
seize  
'fait  
at al  
whic  
struc  
The  
its t  
that  
alleg  
right  
of th  
nam  
S  
argu  
his  
writ  
He  
thos  
deal  
He

compel all children to learn the indifference of all religions as to compel them to learn the truth of one.

Mr. Thompson professes to be a philosopher, and disobeys every principle of philosophy; he professes to be a friend of religious liberty, and would use the weapons of the State to exclude all who believe more than he does, from a share in directing education, and to impose upon all his own theories of religious training.

*Faith and Conduct: an Essay on Verifiable Religion.* (Anonymous.) (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888.)

THE title of this book is a complete misnomer and conveys an utterly erroneous conception of its object and contents. The author holds that a distinct hard and fast line can be drawn between revealed religion, which is accepted on the authority of the Church and the Bible, and verifiable religion, which can be demonstrated by science and reason. Having thus vivisected living organisms which are inseparably bound up in the body of Christian truth, he applies the term Faith to the recognition of such truths as are verifiable by reason. But surely it is only to acceptance of the supernatural elements of religion that the word faith can properly be applied; there is little room for the exercise of 'faith' where demonstration is vouchsafed us. The author's own position affords an apt illustration of our meaning. His mind has evidently been so far influenced by certain modern theories that he is prepared (if we understand him rightly) to abandon much which he once held dear, and to which the mass of Christians still tenaciously adhere. Faith, without disguising or ignoring the difficulties involved, inspires them with patience to wait and trust for further light. 'He that believeth will not make haste.' Indeed, the class of believers whom the author regards as outside the scope of his inquiry would seize upon, and possibly turn against him, his own admission that 'faith may exist in a high degree without having an intellectual side at all. A loyal vassal is the better for fully understanding the law which binds him to his liege; but a loyal vassal, however uninstructed, is far better than the wisest of unloyal retainers' (p. 262). The purpose of the essay is to establish that, setting revelation and its teaching aside, the necessities of conduct are sufficient to prove that we are under the influence of a Higher Power, to whom we owe allegiance and who alone can guide our footsteps in the way of righteousness. Conduct and Natural Religion, in its primary sense of that which binds us to an unseen Deity, would be the appropriate name to connote the purpose of this volume.

So long as the author addresses himself to a restatement of the argument for Natural Religion, there is much both in his matter and his manner which commands earnest sympathy and admiration. He writes with calm dignity and an evident desire to arrive at truth. He is furnished with an adequate acquaintance with and mastery of those questions in ethics and philosophy which are essential for dealing with the class of objectors to whom this work is addressed. He proceeds to lay the foundations of faith (in his sense of the

word) reverently step by step. He is specially forcible in his demonstration that scepticism is liable to all the logical objections and difficulties that it has been wont to allege as conclusive against the verities of the Catholic faith. He sketches vividly the outlines of higher purpose alike in evolution as portrayed by the most eminent of modern scientists, and in history so far as its tangled pages have been unfolded to us. If his treatment of these portions of the subject is at times brief almost to baldness, he can urge in excuse that it is circumscribed by the necessary limits in which he is confined in a day when a big book can with difficulty secure a reader. So far as the writer's arguments are confined to the refutation of the latest infidel theories—the Agnostic position that God cannot be known at all, and the Positivist assertion that the world is under the sole influence of a fortuitous force acting through natural selection—they are clear and cogent. Whilst asserting that all philosophic thought tends more and more to scepticism—an admission which we should take leave largely to modify—he contends that the limitation of man's intellect is overborne by the necessities of life. 'Practical needs bear down speculative difficulties.' In thus meeting modern infidelity on its own chosen battle-field, and wresting from it some of its strongest positions, the writer has done good service.

We regret that our approval of this part of the essay must be accompanied by entire dissent from much that is advanced in the second portion of the book. Whence the author has derived his ideas of Christian truth we are not informed, but he is persuaded that widely distinctive action is necessary, so as to clear the ground for the new edifice of 'verifiable' religion. This is how he states his reasons:—

'The widely-spread modern belief that religion is a matter of action and of feeling rather than of intellect is altogether irreconcilable with the notions in regard to religious doctrine which have been current for at least fifteen hundred years. In fact it is time that the science of theology followed the lead of the other sciences, and was loosened from mere *à priori* reasonings, to be hereafter based on the facts of life and of human nature . . . . The revolution (to be thus effected) will detach the whole of doctrinal theology, so far as doctrinal theology is verifiable, from its former centre, and cause it to revolve about a new one' (p. 205).

As we read these words we almost wonder whether we are dreaming. It is difficult to deal with so vague a phrase as 'notions in regard to religious doctrine'; but to assert that Church teaching has for fifteen centuries made religion matter of intellect rather than of action and feeling would be courageous in the face of such fundamental maxims as '*With the heart* man believeth unto righteousness' and '*Pectus facit theologum*.' It is no less difficult to determine how far the author designs to carry his suggestion that the religion of the future is to revolve round a new centre. Whilst avowing a strong belief that 'we lose grievously in the rightness and beauty of life if we altogether slight authority in religion,' he holds it almost impossible in modern days for any great teacher of the past to secure our implicit submission and obedience. Yet he accepts the test of

perso  
be  
auth  
V  
that  
wher  
ceed  
hous  
exce  
by th  
that  
their  
we s  
drain  
subs  
sacri

A T  
'T

THE  
writ  
cess  
Qua  
have  
migh  
notio

T  
write  
Tem  
incul  
posit  
imme  
name  
"im

N  
testa  
hope  
tiona  
rity.  
suffic

'  
His A  
doctr  
of the  
possi  
fact t

T  
the C

personal experience : if 'this prove that the way is good, that man will be rash who abandons it from any intellectual doubt as to the authority of the teacher.'

We may sum up our verdict on *Faith and Conduct* by saying that it recalls the practice of certain old-fashioned doctors in the days when drenching medicines were in vogue. They deliberately proceeded (to use one of their favourite metaphors) to pull down the house in order that they might rebuild it in stronger fashion. Some exceptionally strong constitutions survived, and possibly benefited by the treatment ; but unfortunately in most cases the vital cement that should bind the parts together slipped during the process through their fingers. Under the manipulation proposed in *Faith and Conduct* we should anticipate a similar result. Vital Christianity would be drained to death, and 'the logic of emotion' would be but a sorry substitute for the priceless treasure which had been so foolishly sacrificed.

*A Treatise on the Immorality of Idolatry.* (Anonymous.) Section I., 'The Metaphysics of Christianity.' (London : Ridgway, 1888.)

THE volume before us is but a fragment of the entire work, already written when this portion was published, and only needing the process of revision to be brought to completion. Had not the *Church Quarterly Review* been pointedly attacked in this section we should have preferred to postpone noticing the work until such time as we might deal with it as a whole. As the case stands, however, our notice has been accidentally delayed.

This *Review* is by no means the only object of the anonymous writer's censure. The late Canon Mozley, Canon Liddon, Bishop Temple, and other distinguished teachers are cited by him as having inculcated, 'under the authority of the name of "Christianity," propositions which are not true,' and, consequently, of adding 'to the immorality of teaching what is false the immorality of taking the name of Christ in vain,' which 'double immorality constitutes the "immorality of idolatry."'

Nor are individuals alone to blame. Protestantism, the Protestant Churches, the Church of England, according to this writer, are hopelessly in error ; and if the Church of Rome is not quite so irrational it is only because in her case 'reason' is silenced by 'authority.' As to the Church of England, the author's condemnation is sufficiently sweeping. He exclaims—

'No single syllable of Anglican doctrine was ever taught by Christ or His Apostles. Neither Christ or [*sic*] His Apostles ever heard of the doctrines of the English Church, and it is certain that if they had heard of them they would have disapproved of them, for they are as nearly as possible a direct contradiction of what Christ and His Apostles did in fact teach.'

The particular ground selected by the author for his attack upon the *Church Quarterly Review* is afforded by an article which appeared

<sup>1</sup> *The Immorality of Idolatry*, p. 105.

in July 1886 on Dr. James Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory*. That article as a whole he finds very obnoxious. 'It shows,' he says, 'the artificial theology of the nation in process of manufacture, and sufficiently accounts for the growth of scepticism, atheism, and infidelity in England;' <sup>1</sup> it contains 'the germ of atheism,' of which the national scepticism, atheism, and infidelity are 'the natural fruit.' <sup>2</sup>

Now what is this nascent artificial theology, this germ of atheism? The only evidence which the author brings into court in proof of his shocking charge is a passage in which the writer of the article asserts that one result of pantheism is that 'the murderer's impulse towards the crime becomes equally Divine with the pleadings of conscience against it.' <sup>3</sup> As the reviewer thus by implication denies that the impulse towards crime is equally Divine with the pleadings of conscience against it, he is accused by this author of denying that God is the first cause of all phenomena; consequently of being, though unconsciously, a teacher of atheism, and even of disregarding the creed of his own Church: 'I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.'

Our accuser, then, regards good and evil as equally Divine; we confess that we do not. We shall not be tempted into the mazes of the old problem of the origin and continued existence of evil. We hold that God is, indeed, the great First Cause of all things, the only Source of life, and energy, and power to act; yet at the same time we hold, as this author does not, that God has endowed man with personality and with freedom of will. In possessing freewill man possesses a power analogous to that of choosing what seed he will sow. The development of the seed, the growth, the future harvest are the result of 'natural causation,' which we agree with the author in identifying with Divine volition; or, to express the same truth in Scriptural language, 'God giveth the increase.' Moreover we know that 'God is not mocked'; the law of the spiritual harvest inevitably runs its course. 'Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption.' Even 'corruption,' then, is the fulfilment of the Divine law; but what is not, in our view, in accordance with Divine will is the introduction and the welcoming of 'corruption' in human life. The murderer's impulse is an example of corruption. The elements of which it is composed will vary in different cases, though in all they may be traced back to instincts Divinely implanted in man for good. When, however, through previous wrong determinations, they take the form of a developed impulse to commit the crime of murder, that impulse cannot, except in the sense just admitted, be ascribed to God without blasphemy. It certainly is not 'equally Divine' with the restraining influence of conscience. The author professes great regard for the teaching of Holy Scripture. We commend to his consideration the words of St. James (i. 13) :—

<sup>1</sup> *The Immorality of Idolatry*, p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1886, p. 426.

\* Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God ; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man : but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin ; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.'

*Essays in Criticism.* Second Series. By MATTHEW ARNOLD.  
(London : Macmillan and Co., 1888.)

THIS little volume, a legacy from one who has passed away from among us very lately, will be welcome to all lovers of literature, particularly to the personal friends of Mr. Matthew Arnold and to the larger group of those who admire his writings. It is hardly a posthumous work, for it is a republication of essays which appeared in various forms in the last decade of his life, with a short but very characteristic address about Milton, delivered at the unveiling of a memorial window. It scarcely needs saying that the Essays are very pleasant reading, never dull, always chatty and epigrammatic, redolent of the artistic skill which disguises the art ; nor, on the other hand, that they are manneristic, apt to ramble, and to reiterate a favourite phrase a little too often. The essayist's theory, too, of poetry is well known by this time. It may fairly be accused of laying too much stress on 'diction' and 'style,' and of haziness in its Emersonian teachings as to what really constitutes good poetry. It is no great help to be told that the poet must have 'soul,' that he must 'deeply feel and deeply enjoy the truly excellent ;' that 'poetry is joy and strength' ; nor even (and this means either too much or too little) that 'poetry is a criticism of life.' All this may be very true, but does not define poetry. Something is wanting to indicate that the one thing essential to poetry is imaginativeness.

But, when we pass from theory to practice, the almost unerring taste of the poet-critic guides us well, for instance, in his incidental remarks on Chaucer, Dante, Pope, and Burns ; and when he characterises the poetry of Dryden and Pope (it seems odd to find Addison and Johnson bracketed with them) as in fact more truly prose in verse than poetry. On the poets singled out for special criticism in this volume most persons will agree with Mr. Arnold on the whole. About Wordsworth he is eminently good, as was to be expected. Indeed the little volume of *Selections from Wordsworth*, to which the essay in this volume forms the introduction, has done much already to rescue the great poet of the Lakes from the neglect into which he seemed in danger of lapsing. But it is a surprise to find Byron placed above Shelley as a poet. Many of the passages often quoted as Byron's finest are, notwithstanding their charm to the ear, declamations rather than poetry, and Byron's theatrical way of looking at things is an offence against Mr. Arnold's canon of 'sincerity.' In the preface to these Essays we are told, that probably Mr. Arnold would have added something to his critique on Shelley. His estimate of Shelley personally is singularly just, except when he seems to explain Shelley's utter recklessness by his having 'no sense of humour.' Shelley's letter to Harriet Westbrook (p. 230) is certainly

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIV.

II I



a *bêtise*, but it is worse still ; unless, indeed, as Talleyrand said, a crime is not so bad as a blunder. Surely the magnificent passages which abound in Shelley, in their beauty, as in their faultiness, exemplify the saying about 'great wits to madness near allied.' Gray as a poet is somewhat overrated in these Essays, but his fastidious reticence is analysed very acutely. His poetry is a link between the artificial and the natural periods in England. Keats is discussed admirably. It would be interesting to trace the likeness (with important differences) between Keats and Goethe. The two essays which come last are on Tolstoi, the famous Russian novelist, and Amiel. Mr. Arnold gives a sketch of one of Tolstoi's most popular novels—*Anna Karénine*—with a graver disquisition on Tolstoi's reasons for becoming a believer in Christianity. With the Transcendental speculations of the Swiss professor Mr. Arnold has not much sympathy, but he allows that Amiel was a master of literary criticism.

What we all owe to the accomplished author, whose last words one would linger over did space permit, is that he discriminates between the commonplace and that which is really excellent, between the merely conventional and the real. What one desiderates is a fuller recognition that goodness and religion are indispensable for the 'lucidity' and the 'seriousness' which we are taught to admire. In a book which deals with modern English poetry it is strange not to find a word of reference to Keble nor to Mrs. Browning.

*La Lettre du Pape et l'Italie Officielle.* (Paris : Perrin et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1888.)

THE anonymous pamphlet of which we have just transcribed the title is a clever manifesto against the system of politics followed at present by the Italian Government ; but being written by a strong Romanist, it starts from an idea which we cannot pretend to share. The author begins by sketching a very deplorable but very true picture of the actual state of society ; he shows the triumph of science, the wondrous progress accomplished in the various branches of philosophical research, and side by side with this undeniable and ever-increasing development he points out the universal decay of morality.

'Spiritual philosophy,' he says, 'carries on with greater courage than hope its resistance against the attacks of materialist positivism ; as the adversary of duty passion raises its head ; against self-sacrifice we find the appeals to enjoyment. Reduced to its last resources, spiritualism enquires anxiously whence is to come the help it so greatly needs, whence she may expect the ally which shall

" . . . . everso succurrere sæclo."'

The Church is there (the Romish Church of course) ; it represents twenty centuries of services rendered to society ; Germany, England, Spain, France, the United States agree in that belief, and declare that compacts solemnly sworn to should be conscientiously observed ; the Italian Government alone denies so evident a proposition.

repla  
hesit  
the V  
influe  
possib

N  
The  
of th  
porta  
pend  
Gove  
the li  
such  
so th  
whol  
all th  
King  
of th  
to th  
lute  
as a  
secul  
What  
cleve  
a war

La P

SEVE  
study  
The  
ment  
tween  
thoug  
inqui  
the C  
mon  
woul  
huiti  
recen  
volum

M  
aimed  
clude  
physi  
limits  
to th  
are in  
cussio

If our author had merely said that a revival of Christianity would replace the moral world on its proper basis, we should have felt no hesitation in echoing his opinion ; but he identifies Christianity with the Vatican, and limits to the Pope the leading and much-desired influence which he longs to see manifesting itself ; here we cannot possibly follow him.

Now let us wander for a short time on strictly political ground. The pamphlet we are now considering repudiates the old doctrine of the temporal power exercised by the Pope, and this is a very important concession ; but he adds that the guarantees of his independence are not to be left to the good pleasure of the Italian Government. The Pope must be absolutely free ; he should enjoy the liberty of declining these guarantees altogether, or accepting them such as they are, or, finally, of insisting upon certain modifications ; so that, besides the Pope and the King of Italy, the assent of the whole Church is necessary, and that is why a decided unity amongst all the Christian Powers would necessarily lead to war and compel King Humbert to yield. Leo XIII. is in a certain sense a subject of the Italian Government, but as a matter of fact he is responsible to the whole Catholic world, and as such his independence is absolutely necessary. Whether this freedom implies a distinct position as a temporal ruler, or the fact of being under the tutelage of the secular power throughout the world, is a point open to discussion. Whatever the result arrived at may be, the present pamphlet is a clever and spirited manifesto against the present state of things and a warning addressed to the King of Italy.

*La Philosophie Religieuse en Angleterre depuis Locke jusqu'à nos jours.*  
Par LUDOVIC CARRAU. (Paris : Félix Alcan, 1888.)

SEVERAL French writers have, from time to time, undertaken to study England and the English from the religious point of view. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, the ecclesiastical movement which fixed the Anglican Church in a kind of *via media* between Romanism and Presbyterianism, the development of free thought—all those manifestations of philosophical and scientific inquiry could not but excite the curiosity of our neighbours across the Channel, and the result has been a goodly crop of both monographs and general histories—*travaux d'ensemble*, as the French would call them. The late M. de Rémusat's *L'Angleterre au Dix-huitième Siècle*, preceded by his essay on Bacon, was the most recent work of that kind before M. Carrau published his excellent volume.

M. de Rémusat had conceived a more ambitious plan, and aimed at a more comprehensive object ; his gallery of pictures includes politicians as well as philosophers, statesmen as well as metaphysicians. M. Carrau, as the title of his volume sufficiently shows, limits himself within the spread of religious thought, and he appeals to that portion of the reading public which periodicals like our own are intended to reach. The writers whom he has selected for discussion are Berkeley, Bishop Butler, Bolingbroke, Hume, Sir

William Hamilton, John Stuart Mill, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and Mr. Ellingwood Abbott, and the last chapter is taken up by a general summary of the doctrines examined in the various chapters and a statement of the author's own views on the grave questions which affect man in his relations with God and with the next world. One short quotation from this *résumé* will sufficiently show the point of view at which M. Carrau places himself.

'Whilst writing these pages we acknowledge that some of the ideas they express may appear out of date to many persons. To a number of people religious philosophy sounds like astrology. In the tide of atheism which seems to carry off the closing years of this century it requires almost courage to venture on the remark that we think we still have reasons to admit the existence of God. By doing so are we not turning our back upon science and progress, are we not proclaiming ourselves the champions of monarchical and clerical despotism ?

'For my part, I am very much taken up with all civic and political liberties ; I am a great friend of progress and very fond of science. But, together with the greatest theoreticians of liberal doctrines, I think that not only they do not exclude, but that they suppose the belief in a substantial Justice and a substantial Goodness ; I maintain that atheism and materialism are rather retrograde systems—the systems peculiar to epochs of decadence and to nationalities on the point of perishing ; I know, finally, that science, positive science, which studies facts and appreciates the general relations which these facts have with each other, declines to have an opinion on the problems we have just been discussing.'

We thus see that M. Carrau's opinions are those of an avowed deist ; he leaves altogether unnoticed the doctrines of Christianity and the weighty questions connected with revealed religion, and it is on the ground of spiritualism alone that he takes up his position to appreciate (very fully and impartially) the theories of the leading English philosophers who have lived from the days of Berkeley to the present time.

*Essai sur le Libre Arbitre : sa théorie et son histoire.* Par GEORGE L. FONSGRIVE. Couronné par l'Institut. (Paris : Félix Alcan, 1887.)

THERE are certain signs just now of a reaction against the fatal doctrine of modern French scepticism, and one of the most remarkable is certainly the publication of M. Fonsgrive's volume on freewill. Attacked at the same time by the extreme idealists on the one side, and by the materialists on the other, man's liberty and responsibility are denied, and *determinism*, as it is generally called, reigns supreme. It was urgent that some attempt should be made to eradicate doctrines which deny the reality of our moral nature, and the Institute of France opened a competition on the subject. M. Fonsgrive's essay obtained the prize, and we do not exaggerate when we say that no work on metaphysics published within the last quarter of a century equals in point both of learning and of style the one we are now noticing.

It is divided into two parts, corresponding respectively to the history and the theory of the question. The author begins by giving

an account of the opinions entertained by the philosophers of all ages and of all creeds on the idea of liberty. Of course here religion must be taken into serious consideration, and it is impossible to appreciate St. Augustine, for instance, the dispute between the Thomists and the Scotists, the Jansenists and the Molinists, without venturing upon theological ground; but M. Fonsagrive is perhaps the only contemporary Frenchman who could do so, for the majority of his *confrères* believe that theology has lived its day, and they ignore it altogether.

As for the part of the volume devoted to theoretical views, if in certain places it seems somewhat obscure, this is owing to the nature of the subject. M. Fonsagrive has thoroughly exhausted it. He begins by submitting to a severe discussion the views of the *determinists* and showing their falseness; he then describes the conditions, the limits, and the action of liberty; and finally enumerates the various applications of the doctrine of freewill to metaphysics, to science, to ethics, and even to art. This book, to conclude, is one which will repay careful study.

*Les Sophistes Allemands et les Nihilistes Russes.* Par TH. FUNCK-BRENTANO. (Paris: Plon, Nourrit et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1887.)

WHAT is the origin of Nihilism? Whence proceeds that strange doctrine which aims at nothing short of the destruction of society? We are still in deep ignorance on the subject, and all the information we possess is derived from novels and other works where imagination too often takes the place of sober reality. Well known as a philosopher and a writer on political economy, M. Funck-Brentano has endeavoured to trace Nihilism to its real fountain-head, and he has supplied with a new and, on the whole, a well-tempered weapon the many who look upon German metaphysics as the source of the decay of religion throughout Europe. Kant, he says, is the great offender; as early as 1799 Jacobi had applied the word *Nihilism* to his celebrated treatises, and pointed out the dangerous results to which they must inevitably lead. M. Funck-Brentano now takes up that theory anew, thoroughly discusses it, and concludes by saying that, with an amount of cleverness and argumentative power which no one can deny, the writings of Kant strike at the root of all certainty; they constitute the most complete synthesis of all the philosophical systems which the eighteenth century and our own have produced. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel receive of course their due share of notice, but the two chief writers whom our author deals with are Schopenhauer and Hartmann, especially the latter, whose sophistries he seems to delight in tearing to shreds.

The theorists of unbelief have hitherto been considered by M. Funck-Brentano; he now comes to the revolutionists who applied themselves to the practical realization of that utopia. Strauss, Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer, Max Stirner are successively reviewed, and from them the transition is an easy one to Russian Nihilism. If the subjects of the Czar are so easily led away by destructive doctrines it is simply owing to the fact that Russia is a comparatively young nation,

easily open to impressions, and most likely to be taken in by deceptive ideas and false promises of material happiness. When we know a little more than we do at present about Nihilism we shall be able to distinguish between the leaders of the movement and to define more accurately their respective views. Herzen, for instance, is of a totally different class from Bakounine, and it would be better perhaps to describe him as a pessimist, a disciple of Feuerbach and Proudhon. Not only did he abstain from holding forth promises of a golden age and of a material happiness based upon the distinction of modern society; he was satisfied with denouncing flagrant abuses, criticised what seemed to him objectionable, and concluded by saying that we must 'continue to live and die with the old world.' Very different is the wild, fierce, truculent system advocated by Bakounine.

In conclusion M. Funck-Brentano's volume is a most instructive one, although necessarily incomplete in the part which treats specially of Russia.

*Les dernières Persécutions du Troisième Siècle, d'après les documents archéologiques.* Par PAUL ALLARD. (Paris: Lecoffre, 1888.)

WE have already noticed the previous volumes of M. Paul Allard on the history of the early Christian Church. The present instalment is distinguished by the merits which characterized the former ones, and deserves the same praise. It treats of the persecutions which occurred during the reigns of Gallus (251-253), Valerian (257-258) and Aurelian (274), besides the isolated cases belonging to the tenure of power of the thirty tyrants, Claudius the Goth, Probus, Carus, Carinus, and Numerian. The great persecution decreed by Diocletian is reserved for the next volume.

M. Allard's work is to all intents and purposes a contribution to Church history, for it is not, as the title might lead us to suppose, a mere account of the sufferings endured by the Christians. Thus the Novatian schism, the plague which decimated the empire under Gallus and gave to the Christians the opportunity of displaying their courage in the midst of the universal cowardice, the question of the *libellatici*, and the first origin of Manicheism are all examined here, and, in fact, M. Paul Allard leaves no event unnoticed which can illustrate the social condition of the Christians and the terms on which they were allowed to live, if we may use such expressions. St. Cyprian, St. Denis of Alexandria, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, the relations of the Christians with the barbarians, the history of the Empress Zenobia and of Paul of Samosata, are also topics which have not been neglected by M. Allard. Much room is likewise allowed to archaeological details, and the introduction which opens the volume contains an excellent summary of the events recorded. The persecution exercised against the Christians was flagrantly unjust; our author shows moreover that it was a gross political blunder. The wise course for the emperors would have been not repression but pacification, for Christianity was neither an enemy nor a cause of ruin to existing institutions, but, on the contrary, a principle of strength and a valuable ally if the emperors would have only trusted its power. The sub-

miss  
their

Les P  
logr

M. P.  
reason  
style,  
to get  
sophy  
his la  
difficu  
psych  
himse  
but so  
be en  
think

If  
rather  
mony  
abnon  
secon  
will p  
auton  
respon  
ninete  
presse  
to wh

'V  
no me  
life w  
by int  
the sa  
world  
and w  
consc  
organ  
to ma

In  
that  
what  
merel  
dition  
sentin  
accor  
aim a  
to the  
has n  
virtue  
laws

mission of the Christians to all the laws which were not opposed to their conscience proves this in the most conclusive manner.

*Les Phénomènes affectifs et les lois de leur apparition: essai de psychologie générale.* Par FR. PAULHAN. (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1888.)

M. PAULHAN'S little volume is an admirable specimen of the kind of reasoning adopted by modern *determinists* and positivists. The style, to begin with, is so obscure and involved that it is often difficult to get at the author's meaning, and the influence of German philosophy has told not only upon the doctrines of the author but upon his language. It is worth while, however, facing that preliminary difficulty, just to see what are the popular views held in France about psychology, conscience, the affections, &c., and the reader soon finds himself in the presence of conclusions of the most startling kind, but so manifestly opposed to reality that the wonder is how they can be entertained for a moment by any dispassionate and unprejudiced thinker.

If we believe M. Paulhan there is no such thing as conscience, or rather conscience is not a natural, a necessary condition of the harmony of the organs in the human frame; it is rather a defect, an abnormal phenomenon; 'it is reduced to act in this world a merely secondary part, it becomes an indifferent, useless phenomenon, which will perhaps eventually disappear and make way for a complete automatism.' It is impossible, we think, to deny more clearly the responsibility of man, and D'Holbach's *homme machine* finds here its nineteenth-century equivalent. In another passage M. Paulhan expresses with equal lucidity and distinctness the sophistries of the school to which he belongs.

'We are compelled to acknowledge,' says he, 'that conscience is by no means a necessary condition of the harmony of the organs. Vegetative life would suffice to prove this. We have not, therefore, to prove finality by intelligence; the concurrence of several phenomena tending towards the same end or towards harmonic ends does not reveal the least in the world a conscious cause, as so many have repeated over and over again, and when we think a little of the question there is absolutely nothing in conscience itself which can authorize us to endow it with the property of organization and of systematization which we might be inclined to refuse to matter.'

In his concluding chapter our author repeats his former assertion that *affective* phenomena—we mean the phenomena originating with what we should call the aspirations and longings of the soul—are merely anomalous facts resulting from an imperfect or unhealthy condition of the organism. Remorse, passion, emotion, love, hatred, sentiments of every kind, are so many forms of disease. Man's efforts accordingly should tend to get rid of them; in other words, man should aim at reducing himself to the state of a kind of automaton, inferior to the plant, inasmuch as the plant is subject to laws over which it has no control and which always act properly; whereas man can, by virtue of his nature, and does as a matter of fact, make or modify the laws designed to rule his existence, asserting himself, whatever M.



Paulhan and his followers may say to the contrary, as a moral, free, and responsible creature.

*L'Europe et la Révolution Française.* Par ALBERT SOREL. Deuxième partie : La Chute de la Royauté. (Paris : Plon, Nourrit et C<sup>le</sup>, 1887).

THE second volume of M. Albert Sorel's work on the history of the French Revolution has just appeared, and it fully confirms the high reputation which the first one had obtained almost immediately after its publication. To say that it casts into the shade the once popular work of M. Thiers would be only faint praise ; but we may fairly affirm that it is immeasurably superior to all that has appeared recently on the subject—except, perhaps, M. Taine's *France contemporaine*.

The special point which calls for a notice in the pages of our review is the chapter devoted by M. Sorel to the position of the Gallican Church during the early part of the Revolution, and the extraordinary measure known by the name of the *Constitution civile du clergé*. We characterize that measure as an extraordinary one, and no juster epithet can certainly be applied to it, whether we look at the fatal consequences which resulted from it, or the absurd and illogical scheme according to which it was framed. All this has been admirably elucidated in the present volume by M. Sorel (livre ii. chap. 1). It seems to us perfectly clear that the interference of the National Assembly with religious matters was the greatest error it committed ; all the bonds which united together the different classes of society were broken, and the blindness of the passions which influenced the politicians of those days hastened the catastrophe.

If the Protectionists, says M. Sorel, had limited themselves to the destruction of the established Church as a power in the State, as one of the *privileged orders* ; if they had merely made this a question of finances and of government, although evidently actuated by a mean desire of retaliation, and inspired by the anti-religious tendencies of the eighteenth century, this plan would, to a certain degree, have been intelligible ; but they in no wise desired to do away with the Church, no more than, in the early stages of the Revolution, they wished to do away with the king. This was their programme : a monarch, servant of the State, and a *clergé-citoyen* (the expression is Talleyrand's), as devoted to the new order of things as the Church of the *ancien régime* was to the king. A religious structure, built by unbelievers, lawyers, reprobates like the Bishop of Amiens, Jansenist fanatics, Huguenots maddened by persecution—such was the dream of the Constituent Assembly, and they fondly imagined that their position was exactly similar to that of the Anglican Church at the time of the Revolution ; they would, no doubt, oppose to the Vatican a congregation of schismatics. Never was there a grosser deception. Spoiled of its property and of its privileges, having no further connexion with either the soil or the crown, the French establishment ceased to be Gallican, and became Ultramontanist ; there was no schism, for the simple reason that no true Catholic would consent to sacrifice his

faith ; and when at last, together with the Reign of Terror, the suppression of all religious belief was made a law, the *sans-culotte* clergy, destitute, with a few exceptions, of even the most elementary notions of morality, had no difficulty in accepting a situation against which all resistance was futile. That the despotism of the *ancien régime* had brought the Gallican Church into bad odour is beyond a doubt ; but that the despotism of the Revolutionists was responsible for many years of civil war is equally certain. For full developments on this important subject we cannot do better than refer our readers to M. Albert Sorel's second volume.

*Registres de Nicholas IV. : recueil des bulles de ce Pape, publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives du Vatican.*  
Par ERNEST LANGLOIS. Parts 1, 2. (Paris : Thorin, 1887.)

THANKS to the spirit of enterprise which animates M. Ernest Thorin, the Paris publisher, we shall soon possess an excellent edition of the acts and bulls issued by the mediæval Popes. It is well known that La Porte du Theil, Potthast, and other *savants* had undertaken to edit all the State papers and documents of the Roman *curia* ; the former of these, more especially, had transcribed no less than eighteen thousand pieces preserved in the Vatican library, but these various publications were not always accurately copied, and they required careful revision. The present gigantic work is an attempt to supplement the researches and correct the few blunders of previous antiquarians, and so far the attempt has proved in every respect most successful. We have now in our libraries the first *livraisons* of the *regesta* of the following Popes : Innocent IV., Benedict XI., Boniface VIII., Honorius IV., Gregory IX. ; and Nicolas IV., edited by M. Ernest Langlois, is the newest addition to this valuable collection. The plan adopted by the various editors has been to give *in extenso* the most important bulls and letters, contenting themselves with supplying a mere analysis or summary of the rest. Bibliographical notes are carefully added wherever necessary, together with prefaces containing biographical details on the Popes whose legislative acts are introduced to the reader.

In the present instance above sixteen hundred and fifty documents are printed, beginning with February 23, 1281, and ending with September 12, 1289. Nicolas IV., as all our readers know, had been elected to the Papacy very much against his will ; but, once in possession of the seat of St. Peter, he determined, first, upon correcting the abuses which had crept into the Church, and, secondly, upon reviving the old enthusiasm in favour of the Crusades. The king of France at that time was Philip the Fair. We need not tell our friends of the dispute which broke out between him and Pope Boniface VIII. ; the evil disposition of the French monarch against the Vatican had manifested itself as early as the pontificate of Nicolas IV., and we can see traces of it in the *fasciculi* now before us (Nos. 736, 752, 753, 825, 1175-77). Heresies of a dangerous kind had broken out in some of the districts south of the Loire, and we find a number of letters insisting upon the penal measures to be taken against the delinquents

(425-430). Another important event is much discussed in this collection—namely, the result of the death of Charles d'Anjou, and the settling of the feud between Sicily and Spain. In a letter dated Rieti, May 26, 1288, the Pope urges Philip the Fair to interfere for the purpose of obtaining the liberation of Charles d'Anjou, who had been detained a prisoner after his defeat by John de Loria. Subsequently (Letters 560, 561, March 12, 1288) Nicolas states the conditions laid down by the sons of Alphonso and James, sons of Don Pedro, king of Aragon, for the setting at liberty of Charles d'Anjou, conditions which were rejected at Rome. A few of the Papal letters refer to ecclesiastical matters in England; two or three touch upon the difficult point of missions amongst the heathens.

The remarks we have thus made will give a sufficient idea of the topics discussed in this part of the registers of Pope Nicolas IV.; the most important epoch in his pontificate has not yet been touched upon, and will supply the materials for the following *livraisons*.

*Le Livre du prophète Daniel, traduit d'après le texte Hébreu, Araméen et Grec, avec une introduction critique ou défense nouvelle du livre et un commentaire littéral, exégétique et apologetique.* Par l'abbé FABRE D'ENVIEU. 2 vols. (Paris: Thorin, 1888.)

OUR neighbours on the other side of the Channel are not, as a rule, considered as good Biblical scholars, and Richard Simon, Basnage, Bochart, have left amongst them very few successors. It is, therefore, particularly delightful to have to notice a work such as the one of which we have just transcribed the title. M. l'abbé Fabre d'Envieu is already favourably known in the world of literature; but this is his first attempt, we believe, as a commentator on the Holy Scriptures. A decided enemy of the free-thinking or infidel school of critics, he examines in detail all the objections raised against the authenticity of the Book of Daniel, and whatever his opponents may think of his argumentation they cannot accuse him of prejudice and ignorance. He does not merely *quote* Renan, Lengerke, Kuenen, Reuss, Bertholdt, he has evidently *studied* them, and he submits to his readers the interesting results of long and patient researches.

M. Fabre d'Envieu's plan includes a new translation of the Book of Daniel, a critical introduction, and a commentary; of these three divisions the second alone is published, forming two closely-printed volumes. The biography of the prophet, the nature, purpose, style, and language of the book which bears his name, all these topics are discussed fully in succession, our author taking the opportunity of refuting certain assertions made by critics, whom he designates as *Persomaniacs*, and who endeavour, with more ingenuity than success, to turn against the authenticity of the prophecies of Daniel, the results of modern philological investigation. M. Fabre d'Envieu quotes the interesting essays issued by the Society of Biblical Archaeology; he alludes with much praise to Dr Pusey's well-known volume, and has not much trouble in showing that the *à priori* wish to invalidate the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures drives the chief representatives of the rationalistic school to the most absurd and illogical

extre  
desp  
this  
not  
tion  
nega  
the g  
T

an ic  
Sept  
had a  
that  
with  
sator  
versic  
justifi

Proci

THE  
our s  
rious  
accou  
which  
stituti  
Fren  
ments  
entrus  
the w  
his sic  
and n  
volum  
trials

TI  
jealou  
towar  
tially  
fight i  
carryin  
the C  
were u  
tually  
all int  
was in  
away v  
first, o  
the ki  
Philip  
remain

extremities. And what, says M. Fabre d'Envieu, is the motive of the desperate and bitter attack made upon the Book of Daniel? Simply this: if its authenticity is proved, prophecy has existed, miracles are not only possible but real. The book itself is a miracle, the realization of predicted facts establishes its divine origin, and the boasted negation of any supernatural intervention on the part of God falls to the ground.

The introduction, of which we have just been endeavouring to give an idea, concludes with a kind of bibliographical summary. The Septuagint version suggests to our author a number of remarks which had already been expressed by various critics, and which tend to show that the Greek rendering has frequently been modified in accordance with the prejudices, sympathies, and aspirations of copyists and glossators. This fact sufficiently explains the preference given to the version of Theodosius, a preference which St. Jerome shares and justifies in his own commentary.

*Procès des frères et de l'ordre du Temple, d'après des pièces inédites et des documents imprimés.* Par M. LAVOCAT, conseiller honoraire à la cour d'appel de Rouen. (Paris: Plon et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1888.)

THE history of the Church during the middle ages does not offer to our study a more dramatic and, we may likewise say, a more mysterious episode than that of the Knights Templar; mysterious, not on account of the causes for which the Order was created or the motives which led to its destruction, but on account of the nature of the institution, its alleged creed and observances. Many years ago the French government ordered the publication of all the existing documents connected with the trial of the Order. M. Michelet, who was entrusted with that work (1841-42, 2 vols.), had already discussed the whole affair in his *History of France*, vol. iii.; M. Loiseleur, on his side, had described the *doctrine secrète des Templiers* (1872, 8vo), and now M. Lavocat condenses and summarises in a very interesting volume the complete account of one of the most singular political trials on record.

The real cause of the destruction of the Knights Templar is the jealousy with which the King of France, Philip the Fair, was inspired towards the Papacy. He regarded the Order of the Temple as essentially a permanent army devoted to the Holy See, and pledged to fight its battles. They had been organized for the express purpose of carrying on the crusades and delivering Palestine from the power of the Crescent; now that these expeditions had fallen into disuse and were universally given up, why maintain a powerful militia which virtually possessed a large part of the territory of France, and held it to all intents and purposes on behalf of the Pope? The nation, besides, was impoverished, the needs of the treasury were urgent, and by doing away with the Templars the threefold result would be accomplished, first, of filling the exchequer, secondly, of satisfying the rapacity of the king, thirdly, of crippling the Papacy. As M. Lavocat observes, Philip the Fair's contrivances ended in a negative result; the Church remained as powerful under the king and his successors as during the

past; more powerful, in fact, than it had been under the reign of St. Louis.

It has been sometimes asserted that one of the objects the monarch had in view in doing away with the Knights Templar was the destruction of the nobility. This is not correct. No doubt the Order of the Temple was recruited amongst the nobles; but the immense privileges it enjoyed, the exemptions from which it benefited, caused it to be regarded with jealousy, nay, with hatred, by the *secular* portion of the aristocracy. Philip the Fair's purpose was to *reform* the nobility, not to destroy it.

M. Lavocat has followed in the closest manner all the incidents connected with the famous trial, and he comes to the conclusion that the charges brought forward against the knights were calumnious and false. The suppression of the Knights Templar was not only an act of iniquity but an act of stupidity, for it deprived the nation of the assistance given by a militia which, almost entirely composed of Frenchmen, might have created a navy, and established on behalf of the mother country commercial and political relations with the people of the East.

*Revue des Etudes Juives.* No. 32, Avril-Juin 1888.  
(Paris: Durlacher.)

THE *Revue des Etudes Juives* cannot be accused of monotony; it embraces articles bearing upon every branch of literature: history, archæology, Biblical exegesis, philology; and as most of the subjects of which it treats are very little known by the public at large, it adds the interest of novelty to those of impartiality and of sound scholarship. The first essay in the recently published number of the *Revue* is devoted to an account of certain Jewish coins, which can be found in several collections, and which are known by the name of *coins of Simon* (*monnaies de Simon*). The question is whence the designation given to these specimens of numismatics? M. de Saulcy, like most antiquarians, following a tradition preserved in the Talmud, ascribes them to the epoch of Barchochebas; but can we explain the name Simon by the supposition that the rebels who followed the standard of Barchochebas made use of a currency struck from a die bearing the name of Simon, whether Simon Maccabeus, Simon ben Gamaliel, or Simon bar Giora? As for adopting the hypothesis of Barchochebas having for his first name Simon, it is quite impossible. M. Graetz, the author of the article in question, discusses the problem very minutely, and comes to the conclusion, first, that the *Simon coins* are genuine; secondly, that they were struck by two important Jews, who lived under the reign of Hadrian. Their names were respectively *Simon* and *Schema*, that is to say, according to all probability, Julian and Pappos, surnamed *the pride of Israel*. We cannot examine in detail all the other disquisitions grouped together in the first part of the journal, but we must at least mention M. Reinach's essay on Mithridates considered in his relations with the Israelites, and M. Bruzzone's account of the Italian Jews during the eighteenth century. With reference to the former of these articles it is the com-

mentary on a passage of Strabo quoted by Josephus, and which states that Mithridates, having sent emissaries to the island of Cos (B.C. 88), took possession of the treasures there deposited by Queen Cleopatra, and of 800 talents belonging to the Jews. As a matter of fact the Jews of Asia Minor, on the eve of the Mithridatic invasion, had placed in the banks of Cos a considerable part of their fortune. The king of Pontus confiscated it, first, because the Jews were detested by the Greeks, whose champion he had constituted himself; secondly, because they were the friends and clients of Rome, his bitterest enemy; thirdly, because he was the grandson of Antiochus Epiphanes, whose hostility to the children of Israel is well known. M. Bruzzone's article is of a financial nature, and interests us as a striking proof of the exactions practised by the Roman curia upon the Jews settled in Italy.

Amongst the *notes* or short paragraphs inserted in the *Revue* we have remarked one on the Phenician inscription of the Piræus, another on a tumular inscription recently discovered at Orleans, and a third on the *sedarim* (parts or orders) of the Talmud. By way of supplement to the present *livraison* the reader will find a very interesting and suggestive lecture by M. Dieulafoy on the Book of Esther.

*A Popular Handbook to the National Gallery, including, by special permission, Notes collected from the Works of Mr. Ruskin.* Compiled by EDWARD T. COOK, with Preface by JOHN RUSKIN, LL.D., D.C.L. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888.)

The long-promised and eagerly-awaited *Catalogue of the National Gallery* will very shortly make its appearance in a new, revised form, but meanwhile visitors to Trafalgar Square may find some consolation in the numerous works on the collection which have lately been published. During the last year we have had Mr. Cosmo Monkhouse's excellent little volume on the *Italian pre-Raphaelites*, and Mr. Walter Armstrong's *Notes*, in which he not only gives the history of the National Gallery and a description of the foreign schools, but treats of the authorship of disputed pictures with learning and acuteness, while the opening of the new rooms has been marked by the appearance of articles on the same subject in more than one of our leading reviews. And now we have a *Popular Handbook to the Gallery*, which comes before us with the sanction and authority of Mr. Ruskin's great name. In the words of the compiler, Mr. Edward Cook, this is 'a collection of the scattered notes upon painters and pictures now in the National Gallery' which have appeared in Mr. Ruskin's different works, and are now for the first time put together and published with the author's permission. Mr. Ruskin himself bestows high praise on the series of notes 'so carefully chosen and usefully arranged by the industry and good sense of Mr. Cook,' in the preface with which he has enriched the new Handbook, but it is perhaps as well to note that he has no further responsibility for the work, and we are expressly told that he has not even glanced at the chapters on the Turner Gallery.

No one is likely to dispute the great value of Mr. Ruskin's art



criticism. We entirely agree with Mr. Cook when he says that 'any student who goes through the Gallery under Mr. Ruskin's guidance—even at second-hand—can hardly fail to obtain some insight into the system of art-teaching embodied in his works' (p. xiii.) Many of Mr. Ruskin's finest and most characteristic passages are to be found here, and not a few of his bitterest invectives. Here and there the occasional contradictions into which the vehemence of his feeling has betrayed him, or the somewhat unreasonable measure of his scorn for Rembrandt and Van de Velde, for Claude or Constable, may provoke a smile, but at every page we feel anew how immense is the debt which this generation owes to the great teacher. We are not sure that lovers of Ruskin will care to have their favourite author served up in this piecemeal fashion, but for those who are so unfortunate as to be ignorant of *Modern Painters* and *The Stones of Venice* we can well believe Mr. Cook's gleanings will be of infinite service. They can read in these pages those memorable lines which tell us all Turner meant in that picture of the 'Fighting Téméraire' tugged to her last berth, or how Rossetti strove to represent the angel-message as it came of old to 'Her who, with a sweet thanksgiving, took in humility what God might send'; how the old Venetians caught the glory of their own sky and sea, and wrought the wondrous hues into the walls of basilica and palace; or how Angelico painted 'Paradise and the Saints' because he believed in them. And we, to whom these lines have long been familiar and precious household words, will turn with still deeper interest to those closing lines of the brief preface in which the great master gives us his last thoughts on the meaning of art:—

'When I last lingered in the Gallery before my old favourites, I thought them more wonderful than ever before; but as I draw towards the close of life I feel that the real world is more wonderful yet: that Painting has not yet fulfilled half her mission; she has told us only of the heroism of men and the happiness of angels: she may perhaps record in future the beauty of a world whose mortal inhabitants are happy, and which angels may be glad to visit' (p. ix.)

The larger part of Mr. Cook's Handbook consists of extracts from the writings of Ruskin, but his labours in this line do not end here. He has been a diligent student of the works of Signor Morelli, Sir Henry Layard, Dr. Jean Paul Richter, Mr. John Addington Symonds, Professor Colvin, and M. Chesneau, and quotes largely from these distinguished critics, as well as from the pages of Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Monkhouse, not to speak of a host of humbler writers whose contributions to the periodical literature of the day have supplied him with a considerable amount of material for his Handbook. In fact, the work has small claim to originality, and is best described in Mr. Ruskin's words as 'a collection of critical remarks by esteemed judges, and of clearly formed opinions by earnest lovers of art.' Oddly enough, as it happens, the writings of Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, the critics whose opinions on all questions relating to the disputed authenticity of pictures are the most frequently to be met with in books of this kind, are not once quoted by the present author,

who  
an  
one  
hav  
piec  
Titi

a m  
just  
toge  
auth  
mar  
has  
Sha  
Wo  
Wa  
pag  
und  
terio  
too  
Col  
Byr  
line  
das  
othe  
mar  
in n  
prop  
of  
trat  
may  
whe  
tack  
to m  
drin  
Laz  
beg  
wor  
twir  
'Tr

find  
pell  
the  
phic  
scar  
the  
Wh  
ever  
are

who apparently is not one of their followers. We venture to think that an attentive study of their works would lead him to modify more than one of his assertions, and, to name one instance, would certainly have saved him from the mistake of ascribing the Venetian music-piece known as the 'Concert No. 3,' in Room VII., to the hand of Titian.

But, while we freely acknowledge Mr. Cook's Handbook to be a monument of industry and patience, and are ready to do ample justice to his good taste in matters of art and his skill in piecing together this vast bundle of scraps from the pen of so many different authors, we must frankly own that his book seems to us wanting in many respects. In the first place it is greatly to be regretted that he has overloaded his pages with quotations from all the poets in turn. Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Hazlitt, Pope, Goldsmith, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Byron, Keats, Tennyson, Browning, Ben Jonson, Waller, Rossetti, Swinburne, and a hundred others are quoted at every page, while even nursery rhymes and old country ballads are laid under contribution and employed as mottoes for De Hooch's interiors or Maas' *genre* pieces. No line is too sublime, no quotation too hackneyed for his purpose. Cardinal Newman's immortal hymn, Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, Tennyson's best known lyrics, and Byron's most popular stanzas are all dragged in. The Laureate's lines on Monte Rosa are quoted twice over, Goethe's 'Kennst du das Land,' and Gray's *Elegy* and *Ode* to Eton College, and a dozen other equally familiar passages are all made to do duty in turn in a manner which becomes positively wearisome. The worst of it is that in nine cases out of ten these quotations strike us as painfully inappropriate. It is all very well to quote *Childe Harold* on the Bridge of Sighs when a Canaletto is in question, or Browning to illustrate the history of Andrea del Sarto, although even this practice may, in our opinion, be overdone. But the case is far worse when we find Mrs. Browning's lines from *Lady Geraldine's Courtship* tacked on to a Madonna by Gian Bellini, or Ben Jonson's 'Drink to me only with thine eyes' chosen to point the moral of a Dutch drinking-scene. The sight of Sebastian del Piombo's 'Raising of Lazarus' can hardly be said to suggest the verse from *In Memoriam* beginning 'Her eyes are homes of silent prayer,' while it is still worse to find Byron's 'Where the virgins are soft as the roses they twine' selected as a suitable motto for Botticelli's allegory of the 'Triumph of Chastity.'

The result of this deplorable waste of space is that, in order to find room for these innumerable quotations, Mr. Cook has been compelled to leave out a great deal of matter which would have been in the highest degree useful and valuable to the student. His biographical notices of the greatest artists are at best very meagre and scanty, often limited to a few lines, and we are not told where to find the masterpieces which made Giotto or Raphael or Titian illustrious. When Mr. Ruskin assures us that the Handbook tells students about every picture and its painter just the things they wish to know, we are driven to the conclusion that he has given Mr. Cook's volume a

very small measure of his time and attention. For surely, in a work which professes to be a guide-book to the National Gallery, it is not unreasonable to expect to find a brief record of the chief facts in a painter's life, the salient features of his style, and the titles of his principal works, as well as the precise locality where they are to be seen at the present time. If Mr. Cook would cut out one-half of his poetic and one-third of his prose quotations, and give us instead a clear and concise practical account of the different schools of painting represented at Trafalgar Square, modelled, let us say, on the lines of the little book by Mr. Monkhouse mentioned above, he would confer a real boon on the uninitiated, and go a long way towards making his work the ideal handbook which is wanted for the National Gallery.

*A History of The Vyne in Hampshire, being a Short Account of the Building and Antiquities of that House, situate in the Parish of Sherborne St. John, co. Hants, and of persons who have at some time lived there.* By CHALONER W. CHUTE of The Vyne. (Winchester: Jacob and Johnson; London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1888.)

MR. CHUTE has admirably performed a duty which all owners of historic houses owe to their country, and his example will, we hope, be widely followed by other English squires. But it must be confessed that few even of our time-honoured mansions are as rich in historic associations as the beautiful old house which it has been Mr. Chute's good fortune to describe. The memories of The Vyne go back to Roman times, and the name is probably a corruption of Vindomis, a station mentioned in the 'Itinerary of Antonine' as on the great road between Reading and Winchester. For three hundred years—from the time of Richard II. to that of the Civil Wars—it was the property of the Sandys family. William, the first Lord Sandys, and most illustrious member of his race, was a friend of Wolsey and of Henry VIII. After serving with distinction in several foreign wars he was appointed Treasurer of Calais in 1517. Three years later he was one of the commissioners who arranged the meeting of Henry VIII. and Francis I. at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, and in 1532 he officiated as Lord Chamberlain at the public reception of Queen Anne Boleyn, when she made her splendid entry by water into London. But the divorce of Katharine of Arragon, and the schism with Rome which followed, caused Lord Sandys great distress, and in 1534 we read that he retired from court and remained a devoted supporter of the ancient faith until his death, at Calais, in 1540. This first Lord Sandys was the builder of the present house and beautiful chapel, which he erected on the site of an old chantry founded and endowed in the reign of Henry II. 'Finding the Vyne no very great or sumptuous place,' says Leland, 'he so translated and augmented it, and beside builded a fair Base-court, that it became one of the principal houses in goodly building in all Hamptonshire.' His marriage with Dame Margery Bray, niece and heiress of Sir Reginald Bray, the architect of Henry VII.'s

Chapel at Westminster and of the Bray Chapel at St. George's, Windsor, probably helped him in his undertaking, and it is very likely that the Vyne Chapel may owe something to this distinguished builder.

At this his 'poor house,' as the owner loved to call it in his letters, Lord Sandys received Henry VIII. twice over—once in 1510 and once in 1535, on which occasion he was accompanied by his new Queen, Anne Boleyn. Here also his great-grandson, the third Lord Sandys, entertained Queen Elizabeth, who sent a despatch from the Vyne to Lord Huntingdon, desiring him to take charge of Mary, Queen of Scots, and to restrict the liberty of sending letters which that unfortunate lady had hitherto enjoyed. Here, too, a few years later the Duc de Biron, Henry IV.'s ambassador, was sumptuously entertained at the Queen's expense, hangings and plate being sent from the Tower and Hampton Court, and seven score beds and other furniture being supplied by the willing people of Hampshire to accommodate his retinue of four hundred persons. A very curious inventory of the furniture, horses, linen, plate, armour, and apparel at the Vyne in February 1541 was recently found at Belvoir, and affords an amusing glimpse of the household of a great nobleman in Tudor times.

'The principal reception-rooms were at that time used as sleeping-chambers for important guests, and contained magnificent bedsteads. There was throughout the house an abundance of fine tapestry, and a remarkable scarcity of furniture. In the great dining-chamber itself there was but one chair, and the table consisted of fir boards laid on trestles, while the guests sat upon cushions stuffed with feathers and covered with leather or tapestry-work, lying upon forms or stools' (p. 51).

In the Civil Wars the Sandys, loyal as ever, risked life and fortune in the king's cause. One owner of the Vyne was killed in a skirmish near Alresford in 1644, and his son found his family estates so heavily mortgaged that he was compelled to sell the Vyne and retire to Mottisfont Abbey, near Romsey. The place was bought by Chaloner Chute, a wise and far-seeing lawyer, who took a bold and independent part in the political troubles of Charles I.'s reign, and used all his influence to restrain the violence of opposing factions. He distinguished himself by his fearless defence of the bishops when they were impeached by the House of Commons, and the silver tankard presented to him by the Bishop of Rochester 'as a memorial of the singular wisdom, heroic courage, and unswerving fidelity shown by him towards the bishops in their extreme peril in the year 1641,' is still preserved at the Vyne. Chaloner Chute was Speaker in Richard Cromwell's Parliament, but died before the Restoration. Another curious relic bears witness to the high esteem in which he was held by Parliament. It is a facsimile of the Great Seal of the Commonwealth, bearing a map of Great Britain, upon which, out of compliment to the Speaker, the mansion of the Vyne figures among the six places marked in Hampshire.

The third owner of the Vyne who made the place memorable was John Chute, the friend of Horace Walpole and Gray. A man of

scholarly and refined tastes, he met Horace Walpole while travelling abroad in 1740, and the friendship then formed lasted until Mr. Chute's death, twenty-six years later. Walpole's letters are full of allusions to his Hampshire friend, whom he called his oracle in taste and the genius which presided over poor Strawberry. When, in 1754, Mr. Chute succeeded to the Vyne, on the death of his elder brother, Walpole greeted him in the following highly characteristic letter, one of many others preserved in manuscript at the Vyne, and published for the first time in the present volume :—

'My dearest Sir,—Don't be surprised if I write you a great deal of incoherent nonsense. The triumph of my joy is so great that I cannot think with any consistence. Unless you could know how absolutely persuaded I was that your brother would disinherit you, you cannot judge of my satisfaction. You know the partiality I have to the afflicted, the disgraced, and the oppressed, and you must recollect how many titles to my esteem you will lose when you are rich Chute of the Vyne, when you are courted by Chancellors of the Exchequer for your interest in Hampshire, by a thousand nephew Tracys for your estate, and by my Lady Brown for her daughters. Oh! you will grow to wear a slit gouty shoe and a gold-headed cane with a spying-glass. You will talk stocks and actions with Sir R. Brown, and be obliged to go to the South Sea House when one wants you to whisk in a comfortable way to Strawberry. You will dine at Farley in a swagging coach with fat mares of your own, and have strong port of a thousand years old got on purpose for you at Hackwood, because you will have lent the Duke thirty thousand pounds. Oh! you will be insupportable, shan't you? I find I shall detest you. *En attendant*, I do wish you joy' (p. 109).

From this time Walpole was a frequent visitor to the Vyne, in spite of the rough and muddy country roads, which made him say if he went there in October it would have to be on stilts. Traces of his visits still remain in the stone eagles at the south entrance, presented by him to John Chute, and in the picture of the 'Last Supper,' brought by him from Italy to adorn what he called 'the most heavenly chapel in the world,' and which, in his opinion, only wanted 'a few pictures to give it a true Catholic air.' And when his friend died he wrote to Horace Mann in these touching words :

'It is a heavy blow, but such strokes reconcile one to parting with this pretty vision, life; what is it when one has no longer those to whom one speaks as confidentially as to one's own soul?' (p. 117).

After telling us the history of these different lords of the Vyne, Mr. Chute proceeds to give a full description of the ancient house itself, with the changes and alterations which have been made by successive owners. It is still in the main a Tudor house, belonging to what Professor Freeman calls 'that happy moment when purely domestic architecture was at its height, and the notion of the great house as something distinct from the castle had been brought to perfection.' A grand pile of old red brickwork, with diaper facing, it retains the stone galleries, the oak wainscoting, and elaborately-carved panels of Tudor times. The crests of Lord Sandys and of Margery Bray, his wife, the Tudor rose, and the pomegranate of

Katharine of Arragon, the castle of Castile, and the crown of Henry VII. figure among the four hundred heraldic devices which adorn the panels of the oak gallery on the first floor. The fair Basse Court, which the first Lord Sandys built towards the moat, was pulled down in 1654 by Speaker Chute, who added the Grecian portico and replaced the mullions of the windows by sashes. John Chute added the grand classic staircase with its Corinthian columns and lovely mouldings, which Horace Walpole calls 'the beautiful scenery of the staircase,' and brought home most of the antique marbles, French tapestries, and Italian damask hangings, which we admire in different parts of the house. The spacious fireplaces are adorned with richly-carved shields and figures, and many of the firebacks are decorated with quaint representations of Neptune and his trident and other fanciful devices. Portraits of Chaloner Chute, the Speaker, by Vandyck, and of his wife, Lady Dacre, wearing the pearl necklace which has been handed down as an heirloom in the family, of Walpole's friend, John Chute, of Winifred, the nun of Cufaude, and of many well-known historic personages, adorn the walls; while endless treasures in the shape of old prints and china, cabinets and marbles, are stored up in the dim recesses of the ancient parlours. But the gem of the place is the Chapel, which has in a marvellous manner escaped desecration and ruin amid all the changes it has witnessed, and remains as perfect and beautiful as of old. Its glorious stained-glass windows, its exquisite oaken stalls and graceful canopies are unhurt. The altar baldacchino, the massive silver standards and censers, are gone, but we can still look at the 'capricious friezes' which excited Walpole's admiration, and wonder at the lovely blues and greens in the Urbino tiles of the flooring. And we have only to study the long list of vestments which belonged to the chantry in the days of the first Lord Sandys in order to follow Mr. Chute in his description of the splendid ceremonial practised here when this little Chapel was first built, nearly four hundred years ago.

We have said enough to show how interesting and valuable is the information which Mr. Chute has given us in so pleasant a form. Indeed, as a French critic once said of the classics published by the famous printer Aldus, 'Everything about this book is excellent,' style, paper, type, and binding. Last, but by no means least in merit, are the numerous illustrations, from the accomplished hand of Mr. Lionel Muirhead, which meet us at every page, and by helping us better to realize the different portions of the building, add greatly to our pleasure and profit. We have not only admirable views of the exterior and interior of the house and chapel, of long galleries and picturesque courts, but a hundred minor details—fireplaces and woodwork, friezes and poppy-heads, coats of arms and painted tiles—all reproduced in the most truly artistic manner. Where all is so good it is hard to choose, but if there is one plate which delights us more than the rest it is the charming little drawing of the round-headed garden-house, by the yew hedge under the great oak tree, which John Webb built for Chaloner Chute, the Speaker, two hundred years ago.



*Atalanta*. Edited by L. T. MEADE and ALICIA A. LEITH. Vol. i. October 1887—September 1888. (London : Hatchards.)

THIS exceedingly attractive magazine is a development of an old friend, *Every Girl's Magazine*, which has blossomed out into new and brilliant life under the editorship of one of our most popular writers for children. English girls of all ages are to be congratulated on the excellence of the new periodical, which is intended especially for their advantage, and which, whether we regard the quality or quantity of the illustrations and letter-press, is on a level with the best American magazines. *Atalanta*, we hasten to add, supplies a need that has been greatly felt in our periodical literature since Mrs. Ewing's death put an end to that favourite companion of our childhood, *Aunt Judy*. It is, in many respects, an ideal girl's magazine, and the variety of its contents is truly surprising. We have, in the first place, several excellent serials by Mr. Grant Allen, Mrs. Molesworth, and other well-known authors, besides a number of short fairy tales and popular ballads charmingly illustrated. A series of papers on 'Girls who have won Success' appeals especially to our maidens, while all classes of readers will turn with delight to another set of biographical articles on 'Famous old Story-Tellers,' which includes the familiar names of the Brothers Grimm, of La Fontaine, and of 'good Haroun Alraschid.' Mr. Cosmo Monkhouse discourses pleasantly on the painting of china, and Mr. Walter Besant gives would-be novelists the benefit of his experience in two admirable papers 'On the Writing of Novels.' These abound in capital hints and warnings, which ought to be laid to heart by all youthful aspirants to fame in this walk of literature. The rules which he lays down for those who wish to acquire the art of fiction are so full of good sense and wisdom that we cannot forbear to quote a few of the most important, for the sake of those among our readers who have not seen the articles in question. 'Practise writing something original every day. Cultivate the habit of observation. Work regularly at certain hours. Read no rubbish. Aim at the formation of style. Endeavour to be dramatic. . . . Never attempt to describe any kind of life except that with which you are familiar. Learn as much as you can about men and women.' Again, nothing can be better than Miss Arabella Buckley's 'Professor's Dream of Ancient Days,' a short sketch which conveys, in an amusing form, a considerable amount of information respecting pre-historic ages and the race of man.

But the two features of the magazine to which we would especially draw the attention of our readers here are, first, the sympathy with all forms of women's work which is revealed in its pages ; and, secondly, the laudable desire on the side of the Editors to promote the knowledge of our own literature, a part of education which in old days was too often neglected. A great deal of useful and valuable information concerning the different spheres of work now open on every side to woman is collected in a series of papers on 'The Employment of Girls.' Mrs. Henry Fawcett treats of post-office clerks, Miss Comyns of type-writing, Miss Garrett of house decoration, Dr. Edith Huntley of medicine, Miss Sophy Lock of needlework, all the papers alike

being full of practical hints and instruction which cannot fail to be of use to girls in search of a profession. The studies of 'English Men and Women of Letters of the Nineteenth Century,' written by several of our best living authors expressly for the members of the *Atalanta* Reading Union, and supplemented by questions on the same subjects, are likely to prove even more generally useful and improving. To be told about Miss Austen and her novels by Miss Thackeray, to hear of Charles Kingsley and all he meant when he wrote the 'Water-babies' from the lips of his own friend Tom Hughes, to learn about Walter Scott from Mr. Andrew Lang, and about John Keble from Miss Yonge, is an advantage which can hardly be esteemed too highly, especially when people tell us that, unlike their mothers, the girls of the rising generation find the *Waverley* Novels tedious, and cannot read the *Christian Year*.

In these days, when we hear so much of the narrowness of women's lives and the unsatisfied yearnings of young girls for greater freedom and larger activities, a magazine conducted on these principles is a priceless boon. No girl can read these papers, or enter the lists to compete for one or other of the scholarships and prizes offered to readers of *Atalanta* in so many various branches of art and literature, without feeling stimulated to acquire fresh knowledge. And the probability is that the intelligent child as she reads will feel herself insensibly drawn into a larger world. As the horizon widens new interests and occupations will open before her, she will find her restless aspirations satisfied, and her own path in life will become clear before her eyes.

In the noble verses of the poet who supplies the new *Atalanta* with a motto—

'Oh girls! 'tis English as 'tis Greek,  
Life is that race: Train so the soul  
That, clad with health and strength, it seek  
A swifter still, who touches goal  
First; or—for lack of breath outdone—  
Dies gladly, so such race was run!

'Yet scorn not, if before your feet  
The golden fruit of Life shall roll,  
Truth, duty, loving service sweet,  
To stoop to grasp them. So, the soul  
Runs slower in the race, by these;  
But wins them—and Hippomenes!'

This is the aim which the Editor and her staff of authors and artists propose to themselves, and surely they deserve to the full the cordial recognition which has already been bestowed on their venture. We have only to wish them God-speed in their task, and hope that in the coming year they will meet with as large a measure of well-deserved success and encouragement as it has been their lot to earn during the one which is just completed. As Socrates said long ago, 'Fair is the prize, and the hope great.'

*The Countess Eve.* By J. H. SHORTHOUSE, Author of *John Inglesant*, *Sir Percival*, *The Little Schoolmaster Mark*, &c. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1888.)

WE have seldom closed a book with a keener sense of disappointment than when we had finished the *Countess Eve*. A new work by the author of *John Inglesant* always awakens in us eager expectancy, and the opening sentences, foreshadowing that the story would deal with the mysterious interpenetration of the unseen into the affairs of this garish world, promised a theme well calculated to call forth Mr. Shorthouse's singular powers. The notorious difficulty of handling a topic which so forcibly proclaims how narrow a boundary separates the ridiculous from the sublime would, we thought, only serve to bring out more vividly the delicacy of the writer's touch. One further essential would assuredly not be wanting—namely, that quickening of genius which vivifies the creations of fancy, and makes them instinct with life and motion. Nor were other conditions of success hard to discern—foremost amongst them, special care that the unseen should not obtrude too palpably, lest it should jar, like Duncan's ghost, upon our sense of congruity, and, secondly, a subtle insight into the dim, though real, mutual relations between the worlds of matter and of spirit. Effective description of scenery, the innate refinement which alone can project upon the canvas men and women of high breeding, and a high tone of religious feeling are of course never lacking in the author's stories. The presence of these latter qualities alone render the *Countess Eve*, even if they may be said to do so, in any degree worthy the writer's reputation. The scene is laid in a French provincial town somewhere in Burgundy ; date, anno Domini 1785. Six puppets—with the exception of De Brie they are scarcely more—move upon the stage. The Count du Pic Adam and his wife, the Countess Eve, 'mysteriously beautiful' inhabitants of a château just outside the city walls ; La Vallière and De Brie, the first an actor, the second a musician, both of good birth and both members of a theatrical company playing in the nameless town ; a quaint old French vicomte, airy, dainty, and bizarre enough ; and a stately abbess—these form the company. La Vallière strikingly handsome, the slave of every impulse, a believer in Mesmer and the fashionable cabalistic *diablerie* of the day, without an atom of moral principle or firmness, is in surprising contrast with 'his bosom friend De Brie, one of those rare natures to whom God has given the faculty of purity, and training has given the winsome grace of an ideal life' (p. 11). La Vallière conceives such a passion for the Countess as his shallow nature is capable of entertaining ; influenced partly by her surpassing loveliness, partly by the vision of an abbé, who appears now beside the lady's couch, now to himself in his solitary walks and lures him on. The attentions of so handsome a suitor are rendered the more perilous by the impenetrable coldness of the Count, who is gloomy and preoccupied with brooding over a wrong he has committed some twenty years before. It were hardly fair to tell how De Brie forecasts the danger, and, aided by the abbess, effectually averts it ; how the gossiping old vicomte unexpectedly bears his part in checking a

crime whose darkest guilt consists, to his thinking, in the fact that it would be a scandal to his order; how the final tableau represents the triumph of righteousness—the Countess clinging to her husband's arm, the abbeß banishing for ever the malefic vision of the abbé 'as she stood like the archangel of God, the crucifix, turning its flashing light on every side, in her uplifted hand.' That it is a pretty story goes without saying; but it wants substance, reality, flesh and blood. So shadowy and faint are the actors that it is impossible to take any interest in them. Granted that it is legitimate allegory to embody sin, and that the vision of the abbé may fairly represent La Vallière's first indistinct conception and subsequent indulgence of evil purpose, yet to move us the subject of such inward experience must be a man, not a mere *nominis umbra*, and the other characters must feel and act with some semblance of probability and consistency. In our judgment these conditions are violated. The Countess Eve, for example, yearns so eagerly for her husband's affection, longs so earnestly to charm away his melancholy and to possess his heart, that visible objects fail to produce any impression, and she sees 'what her intense mental sympathy, her pure love for her husband, revealed to her as that which at the same moment was present to his own mental gaze' (p. 94). We omit the description of the vision—a lake which is thrice described, twice in shadow, once in sunshine, within the scanty compass of the story—a description which includes much that borders terribly near to fustian, with 'its chill, terrible waters, motionless with the stillness of a settled despair, black with unfathomable mysteries of the dim æons of existence, when the world lay void and misty and slimy in the pangs of creation' (p. 95). A soul so completely absorbed in that of another as to share in such a vision would surely not yield itself without hesitation to the dalliance of La Vallière as soon as her husband's back was turned. Without apparently one misgiving, she trips lightly along the path of destruction, and would have been hopelessly lost had not a sudden vision restrained her with a terrific glimpse of 'the face of committed sin.'

Our chief complaint, however, about the *Countess Eve* is not prompted merely or mainly by vexation at its failure as a satisfactory work of fiction. Mr. Shorthouse (unless we entirely mistake him) writes with serious and lofty purpose. He is himself firmly convinced, and he thinks it essential to uphold, in a day when practical and theoretical materialism is prevalent and aggressive, the reality not only of the world of spirits, but of its influence upon mankind. His own conviction speaks through De Brie: 'The whole of Nature is ensouled. There is no such thing as matter, as material existence. Everything is instinct with the nature of God, or of the enemy of God.' But the unseen forms—principalities and powers and possibilities, as he terms them—act upon human nature in conformity with the law of man's being. They provoke and sustain conflict. They wrestle with and become conquerors, or subjects, of man's conscious freewill. There are no doubt facile natures which are swayed to and fro by every gust of temptation, as there are lofty ones over whom its blasts seem to sweep idly; but the romance of life consists

in the play and passion of man's resistance to good or evil influence, in the moral grandeur of his triumph, in the pathos of his fall. Man would be a poor creature indeed if he were the slave of such phantoms and visions as determine the crises of his destiny in the *Countess Eve*. We feel that a materialist would be justified in rejecting Mr. Short-house's delineation of the play of the unseen upon the seen as unreal and fantastic, and we fear that his scepticism would be strengthened by the unreality of the conception presented by so doughty a champion of the truth. It is a minor but not unimportant blemish that the story bears signs of hasty production. A book whose contents would only fill seventeen pages of this *Review*, and for which six shillings are charged, should at least be a highly finished literary composition. We regard Mr. Shorthouse as one of the *élite* in the world of literature, and—*noblesse oblige*.

#### BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, PERIODICALS, ETC.

ARTICLES and 'Short Notices' have so encroached on our limited space that we can only offer a small number of 'brief notes.' Some time has elapsed since we have spoken of the publications of the S.P.C.K. Those which have reached us bear out the complaint that has been made by a writer in the *Guardian*, that they rarely comprise works of cardinal importance in the realm of theology. We give the first place to *A Manual of Parochial Work for the Use of the Younger Clergy*, by various writers, edited by the Rev. John Ellerton (London: S.P.C.K., 1888). This work is divided into eight parts, viz.: I. 'The Pastor of the Parish,' by the Rev. H. W. Burrows and the Rev. R. Thornton; II. 'The Parish Church,' by the Revs. John Ellerton, Henry Housman, and J. H. Fisher; III. 'The Parish,' by the Very Rev. W. Butler, D.D., Dean of Lincoln, the Rev. R. Allen, the Hon. and Rev. Augustus Legge, the Rev. Prebendary Jones; IV. 'The Schools,' by the Ven. R. F. Smith, the Revs. W. E. Ingram, John Ellerton, and W. E. Chadwick; V. 'Fellow Workers,' by the Rev. A. S. Wilde; VI. 'Parochial Work in Exceptional Cases,' by the Rev. Canon R. F. Wheeler, the Revs. George Venables and J. J. Hannah; VII. 'Treatment of Romanism, Dissent, and Unbelief,' by the Rev. A. J. Worledge; VIII. 'Parochial Finance,' by the Hon. and Rev. Augustus Legge. The work is on the whole a very disappointing one, as might be expected from the large number of sixteen persons employed. Grievous inequality of merit naturally robs the book of that *consensus partium* which is the essence of a handbook. It would be invidious to name the instances of marked inferiority, which cannot but strike everyone. It is much to be regretted that the entire work was not confided to one man, such as Dean Butler, or Mr. Ellerton, or Canon Worledge. We are glad to see that Mr. Ellerton has the wisdom to deprecate what Archbishop Benson well calls the '*fierce insistence* upon Fasting Communion.' Not less wisely does he inveigh against the illegal displacement of the sermon at the end of morning prayer, so that the

188  
Co  
wo  
of  
by  
cha  
for  
spi  
ren  
the  
tho  
oug  
Pri  
tha  
  
Soc  
rat  
Gus  
of v  
us—  
a th  
amo  
emb  
  
us  
thos  
with  
for  
eigh  
by t  
all a  
Rev  
five  
in  
calle  
auth  
Gor  
new  
St  
(Lon  
exce  
Atha  
C  
only  
Dear  
close  
  
1  
of on  
illeg  
and  
illeg

Commandments, 'those weekly heads of self-examination,'<sup>1</sup> and, worse still, the Epistle and Gospel, are heard but by a small fraction of the congregation. Of course the gem of the volume is the section by the Dean of Lincoln on parochial work of various kinds—five chapters in all. We have there the fruits of ripe experience, set forth in plain and direct words and flavoured with an excellent spiritual tone. Mr. Harry Jones too has some very shrewd remarks, couched in honest, outspoken language, which testify to the reality of the man. Canon Worlledge's paper shows depth of thought and width of reading. We have reserved for the last what ought to have come first, viz. the paper by Canon Burrows on the Private Life of the Pastor, which, we need scarcely say, is everything that could be desired.

The *Dawn of European Literature*, published by the same Society, has received two excellent additions in *Anglo-Saxon Literature*, by John Earle (London, 1887), and *French Literature*, by Gustave Masson (London, 1888). Both these writers—the last of whom, we grieve to say, has quite recently been removed from us—are thorough masters of their respective subjects; and it is only a thorough master who can compress into a small compass the vast amount of learning and research of which these little books are the embodiment.

To turn to publications of a different class which have reached us from Northumberland Avenue, we may mention for the use of those who would fain 'consider the heavens' an excellent *Star Atlas with Explanatory Text*, by Dr. H. J. Klein, translated and adapted for English readers by Edmund McClure, M.A., M.R.T.A., with eighteen maps. We have also what all will welcome, a series of tales by the incomparable Juliana Horatia Ewing, the unfailing delight of all ages and both sexes. They are as follows: (1) *Mother's Birthday Review, and seven other Tales in Verse*; (2) *A Soldier's Children, and five other Tales*; (3) *The Blue Bells on the Sea, and ten other Tales in Verse* (London, 1888). All of these are illustrated, or, as it is called, 'depicted,' by R. André. Then we have from the same authoress *Snap Dragons and Old Father Christmas*, illustrated by Gordon Browne (London, 1888). Of a graver character is the new volume of the 'Fathers for English Readers' series, entitled *St. Athanasius: his Life and Times*, by the Rev. R. Wheler Bush (London, 1888), which more than sustains the reputation of that excellent series. The concluding chapter on the character of St. Athanasius as a theologian shows considerable mastery of the subject.

On a hasty glance we had put on one side for a 'Short Notice' only *The Lives of Twelve Good Men*, by John William Burgon, D.D., Dean of Chichester, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1888), but a closer examination showed us that the work was one which called

<sup>1</sup> We grieve to record that in not a few churches a practice has grown up of omitting the Commandments altogether! That the omission is utterly illegal there cannot be a shadow of doubt. Whereunto serve archdeacons and bishops, that they give the connivance of silence to these grossly illegal practices?



for fuller handling. For the present therefore we can only recommend it most warmly to all who are interested in Oxford life of the last half-century and in the history of the Oxford movement. The Duodecimviri selected for commemoration by Dean Burgon under the somewhat twaddly title of 'Twelve Good Men' are as follows: 1, Martin Joseph Routh; 2, Hugh James Rose; 3, Charles Marriott; 4, Edward Hawkins; 5, Samuel Wilberforce; 6, Richard Lynch Cotton; 7, Richard Greswell; 8, Henry Octavius Coxe; 9, Henry Longueville Mansel; 10, William Jacobson; 11, Charles Page Eden; 12, Charles Longuet Higgins.

Foremost amongst new editions of the season must be placed *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641*, by Edward, Earl of Clarendon; re-edited from a fresh collation of the original MS. in the Bodleian Library, with *Marginal Dates and occasional Notes*, by W. Dunn Macray, M.A., F.S.A.; in six vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888). We may possibly recur to this work on a future occasion. For the present we will only remark that Mr. Macray's name is a sufficient guarantee for the excellent and scholarly way in which this most admirable edition has been executed.

The annual volume of the *English Illustrated Magazine*, 1887-1888 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888), is as interesting as ever. The illustrations are, if anything, superior to those in previous volumes. Two of the best papers in the volume are by writers no longer with us, viz. *The Sea of Galilee*, by Laurence Oliphant, and *Summer in Somerset*, by Richard Jeffries.

The *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. i., October 1888 (London: D. Nutt), is a new venture, which, under the editorship of J. Abrahams and C. G. Montefiore, appears under excellent auspices, and promises to be a substantial contribution to Jewish life and thought and literature. Among the contributors in this first part the names of Graetz, Neubauer, Friedländer, and Cheyne command attention. We wish it every success. The *Classical Review*, by the same enterprising publishers, has completed its second volume, and abounds with interest for all students of classical literature and philology. The *Archæological Review*, vol. ii. No. 4, December 1888 (London: D. Nutt), contains a short but very instructive and suggestive paper by Mr. Edward Peacock on 'The Dedication of Churches,' a subject of very great importance, and on which a vast amount of work has to be done before we can arrive at any sound conclusion. In the November number of this periodical (p. 215) there appears a short letter from that most recondite antiquary Mr. J. H. Round—with whose name and attainments all readers of the *Athenæum* must be familiar—calling attention to the desirableness of working out the history of the church porch, and of noting all instances of transactions taking place in it. One of the most remarkable allusions to it is found in Eadmer's description of the old Church of Canterbury, quoted by Gervase of Canterbury (i. 8).

In the October number of the *English Historical Review*, edited by the Rev. Mandell Creighton (London: Longmans, 1888), all will

turn  
Lea  
of J  
The  
Nex  
Par

cont  
artic  
they  
conc  
Imp  
learn  
them  
poki  
do.

on '  
the  
the  
wort  
Cler  
the  
syste  
has  
apoc

to h  
Fell  
Artic  
tians  
belie

It is  
depr

ming  
cont  
repli

(Lon  
mor  
Pra  
ians  
Will  
Liv  
now  
gret  
obs

relig

turn with interest to the reviews from the pen of Lord Acton of Lea's *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (pp. 773-88) and of J. F. Bright's *History of England, 1837-1880* (pp. 798-809). They are, as might be expected, the masterpieces of the volume. Next to these we would place Mr. E. A. Freeman's 'Note on the Parentage of Gundrada, wife of William of Warren' (pp. 680-701).

The *Dublin Review* for October 1888 (London: Burns and Oates) contains, as our excellent contemporary always does contain, several articles which will amply repay perusal, and will amuse even when they do not persuade. In the first article Father Morris, S.J., tries conclusions with Mr. Gladstone on the 'Elizabethan Settlement,' *Impar congressus*. In the third, Dr. J. R. Gasquet discusses with great learning the documentary history of the Apostles' Creed. We are then entertained by Mr. T. W. Allies, who was formerly *des nôtres*, poking fun at the Lambeth Conference, which he is quite welcome to do. It amuses him and it won't hurt us. The writer of the article on 'The National Gallery in 1888' pays a well-deserved tribute to the services rendered and the ability displayed by Sir Frederic Burton, the accomplished Director of that institution. The article is well worth reading. 'The *Quarterly Review* and the Culture of our Clergy' contains a caustic exposure of the defects in the training of the Anglican clergy, and a glowing encomium, of course, of the system prevalent in the Church of Rome. Considering what Oxford has become, we fear we must not put down the following story as apocryphal (p. 357):—

'An undergraduate who was reading for the Divinity School went to his tutor, a most distinguished man in addition to being a clerical Fellow, and asked leave to substitute the Epistle to the Galatians for the Articles of the Church of England, in which he did not believe. "Galatians are much harder," replied the tutor. "Take the Articles. I don't believe in them myself. I am inclined to be a Buddhist."

It is only fair to the reviewer to say that he can also tell anecdotes depreciatory (in a sense) of his own Communion.

'A story is told of a priest going to the venerable ex-Bishop of Birmingham. "My Lord, I have certain difficulties on my mind as to my continuance in my priestly functions." To which the Bishop simply replied, "Indeed, pray what is her name?"'

*The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1888) has issued three more volumes since our last number. They are as follows: (1) *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes of this Country*, by William Wilberforce, Esq.; (2) *Hore Paulina*, by William Paley; (3) *Platina's Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii. Whether Wilberforce's *Practical View* will nowadays find many readers may be doubted, and ought to be regretted. Paley's *Hore Paulina*, we trust, can never be considered obsolete.

We regret extremely that publishers of such a high character and religious tone as James Nisbet and Co. should have thought it, we

will not say expedient, but decent, to include in a *Men of the Bible* series a life of the Incarnate Son of God—*Jesus Christ, the Divine Man: His Life and Times*, by the Rev. J. F. Vallings (London: Nisbet and Co., 1889). We feel sure that it can only have been through inadvertence that such an impropriety—and we hold it to have been a very gross impropriety—could have been committed. It would be a satisfaction to learn that the book had been withdrawn from circulation. We are not criticizing the tone and spirit in which the book has been written; that may or may not be worthy of all commendation. We take the simple fact that in a series which bears on its forehead the title of 'Men of the Bible' is included *Jesus Christ, the Divine Man: His Life and Times!!!* Three other works in the same series, viz. (1) *Jeremiah: His Life and Times*, by the Rev. Canon T. K. Cheyne; (2) *Samuel and Saul*, by the Rev. W. J. Deane; and (3) *Daniel*, by the Rev. H. Deane, are before us. The last of these is particularly good. The concessions which Canon Cheyne makes to the so-called 'higher criticism' are to be regretted.

*The Complete Poetical Works of William Wordsworth, with an Introduction by John Morley* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888), will help largely to preserve—or shall we say revive?—that high appreciation of Wordsworth's greatness as a poet which he so well deserves. The Poems occupy 796 pages. The remainder is occupied by xlvii pages of 'Contents,' which supply a list of Wordsworth's Poems in chronological order; by xv closely printed pages of an *Introduction*, crisp and vigorous, by Mr. John Morley; and by 132 pages composed of Notes, Prefaces, a most useful Bibliography of Wordsworth, a List of Biographies, and of the Best Critical Articles on his Writings, an Index to the Poems, and an Index to the First Lines. Much as there is to be admired in Mr. Morley's Introduction, we cannot but note a complete absence of sympathy with what he calls Wordsworth's 'church pieces,' which he dismisses as 'ecclesiastical, not religious.' We must not omit to mention that this edition contains the first book of the first part of *The Recluse*, which was left in MS. by the poet, and is now published *in extenso* for the first time. This poem the publishers have also issued in a separate form (*The Recluse*, by William Wordsworth; London: the same, 1888) for the benefit, we presume, of those who already possess Wordsworth's Poems.

*Westminster Abbey*, by M. C. and E. T. Bradley, with Introductory Chapter by the Dean (London: *Pall Mall Gazette* Office, 1888)—or, to give its shorter title, *The Deanery Guide*—ought to command a large sale, and we are surprised it has not seen the light under more favourable auspices and with better illustrations.

the Bible  
Divine  
London :  
through  
been a  
uld be a  
circula-  
ne book  
menda-  
s on its  
rist, the  
in the  
Canon  
ne ; and  
of these  
makes

with an  
(88), will  
eciation  
s. The  
ii pages  
chrono-  
n, crisp  
osed of  
, a List  
ings, an  
as there  
t note a  
sworth's  
ligious.'  
the first  
y. by the  
is poem  
tude, by  
nefit, we

ductory  
(88)—or,  
mand a  
er more

## INDEX TO VOL. XXVII.

### ALL

ALLARD, M.P., *Persécutions du Troisième Siècle*, 486

Apocrypha, the, 138 *sqq.*; Dr. Wace's edition (*Speaker's Commentary*), 138; Biblical and extra-Biblical Apocrypha, 139; 'Deutero-canonical' Books, 140; characteristics of the writers of the Biblical Apocrypha, 140 *sq.*; the objections to their 'inspiration,' 141; the legends of the Apocrypha, 142; their allegorical applications, 143; the distinction between the Biblical and the extra-Biblical Apocrypha, *ib.*; liturgical use of the books, 144; absence of Messianic anticipations, *ib.*; a deep sense of the Fatherly love of God for the souls He has made, 145; the exclusive privileges of Israel, 146; the doctrine of sin, or human corruption, 147 *sq.*; Semitic or Oriental origin of the chief part of the Apocrypha, 148; peculiar position held by Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, 149; criticism of Dr. Farrar's notes on Wisdom, 150 *sqq.*; the case of Enoch, 150; the teaching of the author of Wisdom, 151 *sqq.*  
Arnold, Mr. M., *Essays in Criticism*, 481  
*Atalanta*, October 1887—September 1888, 500

BANNERMAN, Rev. D. Douglas, *Scripture Doctrine of the Church*, 226

Bernard, Rev. H. N., *The Mental Characteristics of the Lord Jesus Christ*, 474

### CHR

Boswell and his editors, 121 *sqq.*; early need of notes to works on contemporary history, 121; the first *Life of S. Johnson* (W. Cooke's), 122; the sketch of Johnson's life by Tyers, 123; the *Life* by the Rev. W. Shaw, 124; Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes*, *ib.*; the *Life* by Sir J. Hawkins, 125; Boswell's *Tour to the Hebrides*, 126; first appearance of the *Life*, 127; editions issued by Malone, 128; Boswell's method and manner, 128 *sq.*; the text early underwent much 'editing,' 129; Croker's edition, 129 *sq.*; his treatment of the text, 130; Mr. Percy Fitzgerald's edition, 131; the Rev. A. Napier's edition, 132; Mrs. Napier's *Johnsoniana*, 133; the Diary of Dr. Thomas Campbell, *ib.*; Campbell's description of Johnson's appearance and manners, 134; the 'Reynolds' edition of Boswell (Professor H. Morley's), 135; Lieut.-Colonel Grant's memoir ('Great Writers' series), *ib.*; the Clarendon Press edition, 1887 (Dr. G. Birkbeck Hill's), *ib.*; excess of Dr. Hill's illustrative notes, 136; examples of serviceable notes, 137 *sq.*

CARRAU, M. L., *La Philosophie Religieuse en Angleterre*, etc., 483

Christian Biography and Literature (review of Dr. Smith's *Dictionary*), 296 *sqq.*; characteristics of this work and its two fellows

## CHU

- (*Dict. of Bible* and *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*), 297; defects noted, *ib.*; comparison with other kindred works, 298; scope, aim, and sources of Dr. Smith's work, 300; criticism of various articles: Abdias, 301; Alcuin, Ambrosiaster, 302; Angels, the letter of Columbanus to Boniface IV., 303; Barlaam and Josaphat, the Coptic Church, Eschatology, 304; the Ethiopic Church, the Fathers, 305; Grace, Gregory the Great, 306; Iconoclasts, 307; Josephus, Emperor Julian, 308; Popes Honorius, Leo I. and Leo II., 308 *sq.*; Liberius, Logos, 309; Lucian of Samosata, Marina (or Margaret), 310; Nestorianism, Ophites, Origen, 311; Patricius, Patron Saints, Paulicians, 312; Predestination, 'Pseudepigrapha in the Fathers,' Seneca, 313; Silvester, Simon Magus, the *Didaché*, 314; the Holy Trinity, Vincentius Lirinensis, 315
- Chute, Mr., *A History of The Vyne in Hampshire*, 496
- Coleridge, S. T., the religious opinions of, 316 *sqq.*; many-sidedness of Coleridge, 317; his early training, 318; amazing precocity, *ib.*; at the University: influence of Friend, Hartley, Godwin, and Priestley, 319; Coleridge passes through Neoplatonism to Unitarianism, 320; his first appearance in the pulpit, 321; breakdown of his Jacobinism and infidelity, 322; influence of Wordsworth, *ib.*; of Southey, 323; Coleridge's return to Christianity through Christian mysticism, 323 *sq.*; his own account of the process of change, 324 *sq.*; his visit to Germany and the results, 326; his views on the constitution of Church and State, 327 *sq.*; how he helped on the great Church revival, 328; his relation to the Evangelicals, 329; the secret of his influence in regard to religion, 330 *sq.*
- Cook, Mr. E. T., *Handbook to the National Gallery*, 493

## EDU

- DENTON, Rev. W., *England in the Fifteenth Century*, 248
- D'Envieu, M. l'Abbé, *Le Livre du prophète Daniel*, 490
- Dorothy Osborne's letters, 379 *sqq.*; the period when they were written, 380; their authenticity, *ib.*; account of Sir Peter Osborne, 381; of William Temple, 382; character of Dorothy, 382 *sq.*; social condition of England at the time, 384; country life, 385; description of a sermon by Stephen Marshall, 386; Puritan morals, 387; obstacles to Dorothy and Temple's union, 388; her despondency, 389; the characteristics of these letters, 390 *sq.*
- EDUCATION COMMISSION, Report of, reviewed, 189 *sqq.*; statement of the positions of the advocates of religious education and of secular or undenominational teaching, 190; the composition of the Commission, 190 *sq.*; the three Reports, 192; their governing motives, 193; the supply of schools, 194 *sq.*; the transfer of voluntary schools to School Boards, 196 *sq.*; State help towards the maintenance of schools, 198; the Commission's recommendations on this head in regard to voluntary schools, 200 *sq.*; objection raised, 201 *sq.*; payment by results, 203; question of the abolition of school fees, 204; the number of teachers in a school, 205; the Commission's definition of elementary education, 206; training colleges, 206; day training colleges, 207; pupil teachers, 208; compulsion, *ib.*; the office of inspector, 209; technical education, *ib.*; secondary education, 210; evil of frequent changes in the Code, 211; religious instruction: the recommendations of the majority and the objections of the minority, 212, *sqq.*; statistics of Sunday

## EME

schools, 215; the threats of the extreme section, 216; the one-sided, partisan character of their Report, 217; a charge against some inspectors repudiated, 218; the conscience clause and Non-conformists, *ib.*

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 51 *sqq.*; biographies by Mr. Cabot and and Dr. Garnett, 51; sketch of Emerson's life, 51 *sq.*; Mr. Lowell's account of his influence in America, 53; his lectures, 53 *sq.*; felicity of quotation, 54; delight in the mystics, 55; Plutarch and Montaigne his favourites, 56; character of Emerson's works, 57; his philosophy, 58; a philosophical Proteus, 59; his mysticism, 59 *sq.*; characteristics of the mystic, 61; desire to attain knowledge of the Absolute, 62; American mysticism, *ib.*; what led Emerson to mysticism, 63; some of the leading points in his teaching: the theory of Identity, 64; the Over Soul, 65; symbolism, 66; denial of the existence of 'evil,' *ib.*; his Transcendentalism, 67; the speculative dangers of such a creed, *ib.*; 'Father Taylor's' estimate of Emerson, 68

English Ceremonial, 409 *sqq.*; criticism of *Notes on Ceremonial*: the matter largely borrowed from the Ultramontane Le Vasseur, 409; modern Roman ritual full of fussy details, 411; the ciborium, 412; the birretta, 413; blunders of the compiler, 414; his evident preference of Rome to the Prayer Book, 415; his idea of 'the proper ritual position' for the celebrant, 416; his use of 'deacon' and 'sub-deacon,' 417; private prayers of the celebrant, *ib.*; the 'kiss of peace,' 418; brevity of ancient rubrics, 419; absence of an Epiclesis in the Roman Canon, 420; the palla and the corporal, 421; notice of Mr. Micklethwaite's *Suggestions*, 422 *sqq.*; 'farcings' deprecated, 423; the Prayer

## GER

Book the best basis for the student of Ritual, 424

Evans, Rev. H. H., *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, 473

**FAITH and Conduct** (Anonymous), 477

Flood, the Great, 85 *sqq.*; growth of the science of geology, 85; criticism of Mr. Howorth's *The Mammoth and the Flood*, 85 *sqq.*; the conclusions he claims to prove, 86; story of the extinction of the mammoth, 87; wide distribution of mammoth bones, 88; theories in explanation, 88 *sq.*; argument from the food of the animal, 89; the number and un mutilated condition of the skeletons, 91; evidence of the caves and fissures in the Old World, 92; caves in Belgium, Sicily, Malta, 93; evidence afforded by human remains, 93 *sq.*; palæolithic and neolithic men, 94; evidence from the New World: North America, 95; the mastodon, 95 *sq.*; human remains, 96; South America: the Pampas, 97; Australia and New Zealand: the moa, 98; evidence from human tradition, 99; gap between palæolithic and neolithic man, *ib.*; objection to Mr. Howorth's theory, 99 *sq.*; value of his work, 101

Fonsagrave, M. G. L., *Le Libre Arbitre*, 484

Funck-Brentano, M., *Les Sophistes Allemands*, etc., 485

**GERSON**, John, 425 *sqq.*; state of the Church when he lived, 425; his great reputation, 426; his treatises about the schism in the Papacy, 427; position of the Church of France, 428; Gerson advocates the summoning of a Council, 429; his doctrine that a General Council is above the Pope, 430; opposes Alexander VI.'s Bull in favour of the Minorite friars, 431; his sermon



## GOR

on the treachery of Judas, 432; the Pope is not the Head of the Church, but only the Vicar of Christ, 433 *sq.*; Gerson had no sympathy with John Hus or Jerome of Prague, 435; charges of heresy brought against him, 436; his last years devoted to the education of the young, 437; the authorship of *De Imitatione*, *ib.*; his connexion with the mystical theology, 438

*Gordon, General, Letters of, to his Sister*, reviewed, 257 *sqq.*; characteristics of the letters, 257; Gordon's study of Holy Scripture, 258; his connexion of its various parts, 259; early training of children in the actual words of Scripture, 260; connexion between the *Word* and the *works* of God, 261; the value of Gordon's one-sidedness, 262; love of solitude, 263; orthodoxy of his theological conclusions, 264; early religious training, 264; views on baptism, 265; on the Eucharist, 266; his steady spiritual growth, 267; necessity of suffering in the Christian's life, 268; Gordon's directness and thoroughness, 269; stages of weariness, of contentment and satisfaction, 270; in what sense he was a fatalist, *ib.*; no superstition in his piety, 271; practical belief in God's government and providence, 272; painful and patient training that wrought out his character, 274; unaffected self-depreciation, 275; combination of philanthropy with theology, 275; the peoples of the two kingdoms—Christ's and the Devil's, 276; missions to the heathen, 277; the degradation of modern trade, *ib.*; the methods of present-day Church work, 278

Gore, Mr. C., *Roman Catholic Claims*, 338 *sqq.*; *Some Remarks on 'Dust'*, 458 *sqq.*

**IMMORALITY** of Idolatry, *A Treatise on the* (Anonymous), 479

## MAR

**KURTZ**, Prof., *Church History* (transl. by the Rev. J. Macpherson), 464

**LAMBETH** Conference of 1888, 1 *sqq.*; the gathering a token of the Church's vitality, 1; anomalies involved in it, 2; what the Conference has done, 3 *sqq.*; the Archbishop's addresses, 4 *sq.*; Reports of committees: Intemperance, 6; Divorce, 7; Polygamy, 8; Sunday Observance, *ib.*; Socialism, *ib.*; Mutual Relation of Anglican Dioceses or Churches, 9; Home Reunion, 10 *sqq.*; Bishop of Sydney's Resolution thereon, 11 *n.*; Scandinavians, Old Catholics, and others, 13 *sq.*; the Church of Holland, 15 *sq.*; the 'Holy Orthodox Eastern Church,' 17; the *Filioque* clause, 18; authoritative standards of faith and worship, 19; the *Quicunque vult* and the Nicene Creed, 19 *sqq.*; the Thirty-nine Articles, 22

Langlois, M. E., *Registres de Nicolas IV.*, 489

Lavocat, M., *Procès des frères du Temple*, 491

*Lettre du Pape et l'Italie Officielle* (Anonymous), 482

Livius, Rev. T., *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome*, etc., 219

**MAGUIRE**, Prof. T., *Proteus*, 230

Martineau's *Study of Religion*, 23 *sqq.*; relation of religion and morals, 23; the author's method of tracing the sources of religion, 24; his eloquence, *ib.*; his wit, 25; treatment of Kant's theory on man's intellectual powers, 26; relativity of human knowledge, 27; the 'unknowable,' 28; what is meant by a 'cause,' 29; poise and counterpoise of the Ego and the non-Ego, 30; what the notion 'cause' presupposes, 31; belief in intelligent will as the originating prin-

## MAT

ciple of the world, 32; teleology and 'natural selection,' 33; treatment of objections to teleology, 34; God's attributes as Creator, *ib.*; universal sense of a moral authority, 35 *sq.*; conceptions of God arising out of man's moral nature, 36; both sets of conceptions lead us to *one* God, 37 *sq.*; an answer to Pessimists: pain and death, 39; the predaceous habits of many animals, 40; problem of moral evil, 41; 'the triumph of force in history,' 42; some defects of Dr. Martineau's work, 43; *résumé* of his arguments, 44; danger of an exaggeration arising from our experiences of causality, 45; the idea of Revelation springs out of the argument from morals, 46; contrast of the presentation of Theism in *Robert Elsmere* and that of Dr. Martineau, 48 *sqq.*

Maturin, Rev. W., *The Blessedness of the Dead in Christ*, 233

Morality and its sanction, 68 *sqq.*; growth of the doctrine of Evolution, 69; notice of *Progressive Morality* and *The Principles of Morals* (by Prof. Fowler and the late Prof. Wilson), 69 *sq.*; their treatment of their theory, 70; progressive growth of man's moral consciousness from self-regarding, sympathetic, semi-social tendencies, 71; the work of Conscience and of Imagination, 72; functions of moral consciousness, 73; action of moral judgment, 73 *sq.*; grounds of praise or censure on actions, 74; origin of moral rules, *ib.*; the moral idea springs from 'the very constitution of our nature,' 75; Prof. Fowler's treatment of the freedom of the will, *ib.*; anti-metaphysical bias, 76; treatment of the virtue of obedience, 77; the question of labour and capital, 77 *sq.*; general criticism of his theory, 78 *sqq.*; the progress of morality has been governed by law, 79; contrast of Prof. Fowler's and Prof. Green's

## OLD

views on the State, 80; intellectual development not necessarily an assistance to moral growth, 81; functions of Conscience, 82; the connexion of morality and religion lies through conscience, 83; general characteristics of the works under review, 84

**NAMES** of God in *Holy Scripture*, *The* (review of Mr. Jukes's work), 280 *sqq.*; spirit and object of the work, 280; statement of the naturalistic view, that the names are merely appellatives, 281; the Bible idea of revelation exemplified, 282; the Angel of the Lord: the Seeing One: the Lord, *ib.*; the names grow out of the revelations God has made of Himself, 283; Bible treatment of our natural knowledge of God, *ib.*; where natural knowledge stops short revealed knowledge comes in, 284; the particular names of God: Elohim, 285; the passage from El to Elohim, 286; etymology, *ib.*; the truth embodied in the name: the Creation, 287; the Flood, 288; the name is associated with the everlasting covenant, 289; the peculiar grammatical construction of 'Elohim,' 290; modes in which the plural has been explained, *ib.*; the 'quantitative plural,' 291; the name Jehovah: its etymology, 292; it is the revelation of the attitude of God in view of the fall, 293; illustrations of the name in the history of Paradise, the Flood, and the giving of the Law, 294; in the prophets, 295; in the later prophets, embodying a foreshadow of the New Testament, *ib.*; El Shaddai, 296  
New Books, New Editions, etc., Brief Notes on, 254, 504

**OLD Testament in Greek**, *The*, edited by Dr. H. B. Swete, 461

L L

## OPT

Optimistic flaws in modern thought, 439 *sqq.*; need of a balance between two extremes, 440; optimism of Leibnitz, 441; past disappointments and present hopes, 442; modern endeavour to combine the theories of Leibnitz and Descartes, *ib.*; modern evolutionists, 443; difficulties suggested by the dissolution that must come, 444; Emerson's optimism, 445; cultured or æsthetic optimism, 446; Matthew Arnold's secret of 'exhilaration,' 447; the 'social happiness' principle, 448; the doctrine of 'laissez faire,' 449; the present social 'militant movement,' 450; political optimism, 451; economic evolution and Collectivism, 453; Christian Socialists in France, 454; their fundamental principles, 455; 'Co-operative production,' 456; the hopes of transcendental optimism, 457 *sq.*

Overton, Rev. Canon, *Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln*, 234

PALGRAVE, Mr. W. Gifford, *Ulysses*, 250

Paulhan, *Les Phénomènes affectifs*, etc., 487

Pressensé, Dr., *The Ancient World and Christianity*, 472

Prothero, Rev. Canon, *The Armour of Light*, 253

Pünjer, Dr., *History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion*, etc., 470

QUIGNON Breviary, the, 252, 353 *sqq.*; the first text, 353; need of a reform of the Breviary, 354; work of the Theatines, *ib.*; Quignon's work and his assistants, 355; popularity of the first text, 356; why the second text was prepared, *ib.*; its treatment in Spain, 357; places where it was partially adopted, 358; objections to it, 359; condemnation by Paul IV., *ib.*; method of Quignon's scheme, 360; the

## REN

Psalter, *ib.*; Canticles and *Te Deum*, 361; antiphons in the second text only, 362; Lectionary, *ib.*; *Dominica vagantes*, 363; Lectionary of the second text, 364; amount of Holy Scriptures to be read in the two texts, 365; third lessons for Saints' days, *ib.*; Conception of the B.V.M., 366; *Sanctorale*, 366 *sq.*; *Pater Noster*, *Ave Maria*, *Confiteor*, *Gloria Patri*, 368; Mattins and Lauds, *ib.*; Little Hours, 369; Little Office of the B.V.M. and Office for the Dead, *ib.*; abolition of versicles and responds, 370; Hymns, 371; Collects, 372; Quignon's preface paraphrased in Edward VI.'s Prayer Book, 373 *sqq.*; Thomasius's Breviary, 376; similarities in the Prayer Book with Quignon's Breviary, 377 *sq.*; influence of Quignon's reform on Pius V.'s Breviary, 379

REID, Mr. T. Wemyss, *The Life of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster*, M.P., 241

Renan's History of Israel, 391 *sqq.*; elimination of the supernatural, 391; Greek influence on humanity placed higher than that of Israel, 392; the author writes from a Greek point of view, 393; his method of treatment of Old Testament materials, 394; how he decides between true and false, 395; facts doubtful, persons mythical, but every detail certain, 366; Genesis only valuable to the scientific historian, 397; acknowledging Israel's widespread influence, he fails to explain it, 398; 'tent life' the origin of Israel's religion and morality, 399; inadequacy of M. Renan's explanation of Israelitic monotheism, 400; the proto-Chaldean cosmogony was 'boiled down' to make Genesis, 402; his treatment of 'Jahveh,' 403; methods of producing evidence, 404; by his pessimistic estimate of Israel's history he destroys its natural

## REV

development, 405; his description of the prophets' relation to religion is contrary to the facts, 406; the work offers no real help towards the solution of difficult problems, 407; its flippant contempt for religion will prevent its doing much harm, 408

*Revue des Etudes Juives*, 492

Richardson, Mr. E. C., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 230

Rivington, Rev Luke, *Authority*, 332 sqq.; *Dust*, 458 sqq.

Roman Question, the (review of Mr. Rivington's *Authority* and Mr. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*), 332 sqq.; the object of Mr. Rivington's book, 333; Rome's modern view of the position of non-Roman Christian communities, *ib.*; the charge of lack of authority in the Church of England, 334; the assault on the Anglican Succession, 335; Mr. Rivington's argument on jurisdiction, 336; no jurisdiction of St. Peter over the other Apostles recorded, 337; Mr. Gore's book: its method, 338; Mr. Rivington's novel theory as to the Head of the Church, 339; (Ecumenical councils, 340; Papal infallibility, *ib.*; the nature of schism, 341; Anglican ordinations, *ib.*; Mariolatry, 342; examination of the argument that 'the Popes have either only claimed their *right* or were one and all impostors,' 343; the claim of the deposing power, *ib.*; how it grew up, 344; divided (Roman) opinions on the claim, 345; the argument of escape (in Rome) from theological difficulties: the doctrine about hell, 346; the recent revolution of eschatology has also affected Rome, 347; examples from Roman Catholic theologians, 347; Massillon and Lacordaire on opposite sides, 349; Mr. Rivington's argument from distinguished names of converts to Rome, 350; the *per contra* side, 351; the outcome is a solemn warning, 352

## TRU

SHORTHOUSE, Mr. J. H., *The Countess Eve*, 502  
Sorel, M. A., *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, 488  
Street, Mr. A. E., *Memoir of George Edmund Street, R.A.*, 237

TEACHING of the Apostles, *The*, edited by Professor J. Rendel Harris, 224

Thompson, Mr. D. G., *The Religious Sentiments of the Human Mind*, 475

Trench, Archbishop, *Letters and Memorials of*, 174 sqq.; objections to the plan of the work, 174 sq.; the Archbishop an Irishman, 176; esteem in which he was held by the Irish Church, 176 sq.; his deficiency in many fields to popularity, 178; the story of Revision told in this book wholly from an English point of view, 179; position taken up by the Archbishop in the Synod, 180; the outbreak about Mr. Portal's *Manual*, 181: the Archbishop's unfitness for a leader of a popular assembly, 182; who the real fighters in the Revision contest were, 183; the Preface to the New Irish Prayer-Book, 184; letters from Dr. Pusey to Archbishop Trench, 185; opinions on Revision expressed by the Archbishop in his Charges, 186; the Revision has never done any good, 187; the great value of the opinions and of the example of Archbishop Trench, 188

Truthfulness in science and religion—criticism of *Science and the Bishops*, by Prof. Huxley, 101 sqq.; general teaching of the article, 102; in what sense is the severance of science and theology impossible, 103; the functions of the mind in science and in religion, 104; non-essential and essential connexions, 105; science deals with facts only, 106; religion leads us from facts to acts, 107; limits of science as a source of truth, *ib.*; life in

## TUR

itself and in its acts is hid from science, 108; she has nothing to do with what ought to be, only with what is, 109; the case of physical facts which depend on human will, 110; belief in physical facts to which no scientific test can be applied, 111; the evidence on which such belief rests, *ib.*; science as a judge of man's history, 111 *sq.*; the claim of scientific men that they prize the 'spiritual elements of Christianity,' 113 *sq.*; their rejection of 'the miraculous,' 115 *sq.*; what Christians mean by the spiritual, 117; God's connexion with the mind and life of man is the basis of Christianity, 117 *sq.*; the character of the evidence for the miraculous, 118; miraculous Christianity will never be expelled save by a religion which will do better the work which it now effects, 119; there are no signs of the invention of such a form of religion, 120

Turnock, Rev. J. R., *One Body*, 237

**V**ENICE, *The Makers of* (by Mrs. Oliphant), review of, 153 *sqq.*; the great attraction of all that is connected with Venice, 153; increased interest manifested at the present time, 154; the romance of her story, 155;

## WIT

difficulties of Mrs. Oliphant's task, 156; her sources, 157; a picture of the Venice of the early Doges, 157; the national festival of *La Sensa*, 158; the story of the Doges Orseoli, 159; the Crusader Doges, 160; the Council of Ten, *ib.*; the tragedy of Carmagnola, 161; the story of Marco Polo, 162; the MS. account of his travels, 164; Zeno, 165; Colleoni, *ib.*; League of Cambray, *ib.*; Venice the haven of scholars, 166; Venetian art: the two Bellini, *ib.*; Giorgione, Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese, 167; the house where Titian died, 167; Petrarch and Boccaccio in Venice, 168; the conquest of Candia, 169; illustrious native chroniclers of Venice, 170; Marino Sanudo's work, *ib.*; Aldus Minutius, 171; the splendid work produced by his press, 173  
*Vera*, the Author of, *Ninette: an Idyll of Provence*, 245

**W**EISS, Dr. B., *Introduction to the New Testament*, 471

*Westminster and other Sermons*, by the late Archbishop Trench, 232

Whitelaw, Rev. T., *The Gospel of St. John, an Exposition exegetical and homiletical*, 229

Withrow, Rev. W. H., *The Catacombs of Rome*, etc., 469

liphant's  
t, 157; a  
the early  
l festival  
story of  
59; the  
ne Coun-  
agedy of  
story of  
MS. ac-  
4; Zeno,  
eague of  
he haven  
tian art:  
iorgione,  
nese, 167;  
died, 167;  
uccio in  
quest of  
us native  
70; Ma-  
; Aldus  
ndid work  
173  
nette: an

duction to  
t, 471  
Sermons,  
Trench,

Gospel of  
n exegeti-  
The Cata-  
9